

**VOLUME 6**

**DRAFT  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**GREGORY CANYON LANDFILL**

**San Diego County, California**

**APPENDIX J-LAND USE AND PLANNING**

- General Plan Consistency Analysis, PCR Services Corporation, November 2012



**APPENDIX J**  
**General Plan Consistency Analysis**



## APPENDIX J

### GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

---

On August 3, 2011, the Board of Supervisors of San Diego County adopted a General Plan Update for unincorporated lands within County jurisdiction.<sup>1</sup> The County General Plan is comprised of five Elements, Land use, Mobility, Conservation and Open Space, Safety, and Noise, each with its own set of goals, objectives and policies. The following tables provide an analysis of the alternatives evaluated in the Gregory Canyon Landfill EIS relative to their consistency with applicable goals, objectives, and policies of the applicable General Plan and community plans. For those alternatives located within unincorporated San Diego County (Gregory Canyon, Aspen Road, Gopher Canyon Road, Merriam Mountain, and East Otay Mesa), Tables 1 through 3 provide a side-by-side comparison of the alternative and its consistency with the goals and policies of the County General Plan and respective community plans or subregional plans. The alternatives are compared to all of the policies of the Land use, Mobility, Conservation and Open Space, Safety, and Noise Elements. Because many policies of the Land Use, Mobility, Conservation and Open Space, Safety, and Noise Elements are not specifically applicable to any of the alternatives, these are presented in a separate table with an explanation as to why they are not applicable. Thus, the analysis of the alternatives located in unincorporated San Diego County is divided into three tables, as follows: **Table 1, Comparison of Alternatives to Applicable Policies of the San Diego County General Plan; Table 2, Comparison of Alternatives to Applicable Policies of Community/Subregional Plans; and Table 3, General Plan Policies Deemed Not Applicable.** The evaluations in Tables 1 through 3 assume development of the alternative sites by the applicant of the Gregory Canyon Landfill and do not represent actual development of the sites for landfill purposes by others.

The Sycamore Canyon Expansion Alternative is located within the boundaries of the City of San Diego and is subject to the policies of the City of San Diego General Plan. **Table 4, Analysis of Sycamore Canyon Expansion**, which is based on Table 5.1-1 of the Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan Revised Final EIR (May 2012), compares the consistency of that alternative to the respective policies of the City's General Plan, the East Eliot Community Plan, and the City of Santee General Plan. The evaluation in Table 4 assumes development of the Sycamore Canyon Expansion Alternative as presented in the Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan EIR.

---

<sup>1</sup> Following adoption of the Draft General Plan Update, the Board voted to schedule a workshop (November 9, 2011) to review property specific requests submitted during the Update hearings that were not included in the adopted plan. The previous staff analysis of each request will be supplemented with additional information regarding conformance with the newly adopted General Plan Guiding Principles and with implications of amending the General Plan to incorporate the request (including any potential impacts to the current effort to update the Forest Conservation Initiative area).

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
CHAPTER 3 LAND USE ELEMENT					
General Plan Land Use Designation Map:	<b>Consistent:</b> The Gregory Canyon site is designated Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility). The proposed landfill is consistent with the Public/Semi-Public Land designation.	<b>Not Consistent:</b> The Aspen Road site is designated as Rural Lands (RL20), Rural Lands (RL-40) and Semi-Rural Lands (SR-2). A landfill would not be consistent with these designations.	<b>Not Consistent:</b> The Gopher Canyon Road site is designated as Specific Plan Area, Rural Lands (RL20), Semi-Rural Residential, (SR-4), and Public Agency Lands (Extractive/Industry). The designated Public Agency lands comprise a relatively small area along the east boundary of the property and reflect a larger off-site area used for quarry operations. Two small sections along the west boundary are designated as Public/Semi Public Facilities (Transportation/Communication/Utilities). The alternative would not be consistent with the General Plan designations for the property.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> With the exception of a small parcel designated as Public/Semi Public Facilities (Transportation/Communication/Utilities) adjacent to the I-15 right-of-way, the Merriam Mountain site is designated as Rural Lands (RL-20). Because this designation and zoning is intended to allow low density residential and agricultural uses, a landfill would not be consistent with the Rural Lands General Plan designation. In addition, a landfill would not be consistent with the Public/Semi Public Facilities designation that applies to the small parcel on the site.	<b>Consistent:</b> The East Otay Mesa site is designated Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility). The proposed landfill is consistent with the Public/Semi-Public Land designation.
GOAL LU-2 Maintenance of the County's Rural Character. Conservation and enhancement of the unincorporated County's varied communities, rural setting, and character.	<b>Consistent.</b> As a special purpose designation, a landfill is considered neither urban nor rural, but rather an infrastructure element similar to roads or utilities, such as water and sewer. The area is generally rural in character with pockets of intensive extractive, commercial, and infrastructure uses. The area west and south of the site consists of agricultural estate-density residential development; directly north of the site is a former sand and gravel mining operation; Rosemary's Mountain quarry is located west of Gregory Canyon just to the west of Rice Canyon Road. High intensity infrastructure uses in the area also include the SDG&E 230 kilovolt and 69 kilovolt transmission lines which traverse the site and neighboring properties in a north-south direction along the eastern wall of Gregory Canyon. The primary commercial use in the area is the Pala Resort and Casino, on the Pala Reservation immediately east of the Gregory Canyon site. Land uses to the west and south are primarily agricultural. A broad area surrounding	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The Aspen Road site and the surrounding area are predominantly rural. Landfills are a special purpose use and necessary as final disposal sites for waste generated in developed or developing urban, suburban and rural areas. The siting of a landfill does not attract development of either urban or rural character within close proximity to the landfill. Goal LU-1 to ensure that the land uses and densities depicted on the Land Use Map reflect the unique issues, character, and development objectives for a Community Plan area. The alternative would not be consistent with the underlying zoning on a site that is predominantly zoned as a rural use (RL-40) and would be located in an area that is predominantly rural. The alternative would, therefore, change the character of the area by its high level of activity, in an area where there is no expectation of such activity.	<b>Consistent.</b> The surrounding area is characterized by a mix of uses, including an active quarry, country club and golf course, spa, open space, and residential subdivisions in the Semi-Rural (SR-2) zone to the west. A portion of the site has been approved for a 35-lot, semi-rural subdivision in the SR-4 zone. The anticipated use of the site as a residential development (the site has been graded and developed with 35 housing pads), the mix of zones and land use designations on the site, and the mix of uses and activities surrounding and within the site indicate the expectation of a fairly high level of activity in the area. Although the landfill would change the land use character anticipated by the General Plan, the higher activity level would not be inconsistent with the expected activity of the area.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The Merriam Mountain site and the surrounding Merriam Mountains are predominantly rural and undeveloped. Policy LU-2.4 is intended to ensure that the land uses and densities depicted on the Land Use Map reflect the unique issues, character, and development objectives for a Community Plan area. The alternative would, therefore, change the character of the area by its high level of activity, in an area where there is no expectation of such activity and, as such, would be inconsistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> As a special purpose designation, a landfill is considered neither urban nor rural, but rather an infrastructure element similar to roads or utilities, such as water and sewer. The area is generally rural in character with open space/agricultural lands to the west. The nearest land uses include an industrial park in the vicinity of Siempre Viva Road, to the east of SR 905. The industrial mix of uses in the area and, surrounding open space that would separate the landfill from less intensive uses, would be consistent with the character of the area.

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
	to the north of SR 76 is undeveloped open space. The alternative would provide a minimum of 1,313 acres of permanent open space, which would be consistent with and contiguous to open space that occurs in the area. Upon closure, the entire site (approximately 1,770 acres) would be maintained as permanent open space. Because of the mix of uses in the area and, with the provision of open space and other design features, the alternative would be consistent with the character of the area.				
Policy LU-2.4 Relationship of Land Uses to Community Character. Ensure that the land uses and densities within any Regional Category or Land Use Designation depicted on the Land Use Map reflect the unique issues, character, and development objectives for a Community Plan area, in addition to the General Plan Guiding Principles.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is located in an area that consists of a mix of rural residential, agricultural, and industrial uses. Because this alternative is consistent with the Land Use Designation of Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility) depicted on the Land Use Map, it would be consistent with this policy and the development objectives for the Community Plan area.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The site is located in an area designated as rural lands. The activities of a landfill, including truck traffic, would not be consistent with the rural character of the community or consistent with the existing onsite and surrounding land use designation. Therefore, a landfill would not meet the development objectives for the Community Plan area.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The site is designated as Specific Plan Area, rural lands, and semi-rural residential lands. The site is adjacent to a utilities zone (transportation/ communication) and a designated extractive industries area. A proposed landfill would not be consistent with the underlying land use designation of the majority of surrounding land uses, but would not be inconsistent with the nearby quarry use.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The Merriam Mountain property is designated as Rural Lands (RL-20). Because this designation and zoning is intended to allow low density residential and agricultural uses, a landfill would not be consistent with the General Plan designation.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is located in an area that consists of a mix of open space, agricultural, and industrial uses and is located immediately east of the East Otay Mesa Business Park Specific Plan area. The Specific Plan includes a 1,000-foot buffer between the landfill and uses to the west of the alternative site and, because this alternative is consistent with the Land Use Designation of Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility) depicted on the Land Use Map, it would be consistent with this policy and the development objectives for the Community Plan area.
Policy LU-2.6 Development near Neighboring Jurisdictions. Require that development in the proximity of neighboring jurisdictions retain the character of the unincorporated community and use buffers or other techniques where development in the neighboring jurisdiction is incompatible.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is not located in the proximity of other city or county lines. Pala Tribal Lands border the site to the east, east of the crest of Gregory Mountain. The crest and east side of Gregory Mountain, within the Gregory Canyon ownership, form a natural barrier between the landfill and Pala lands. The Gregory Canyon landfill is not visible from nor does it abut tribal lands. Also, there is no land use plan for tribal lands that would indicate conflict of uses. Therefore, the landfill does not affect the character of this neighboring jurisdiction.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The Aspen Road site is located near the Riverside County line. It would not be consistent with the existing rural, open space character of the land uses in the adjoining jurisdiction. In May 2012, the County Board of Supervisors certified an EIR for Liberty Quarry located on a 414-acre site between Temecula and the border between Riverside and San Diego Counties. However, the project was denied. A revised quarry project is pending review.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located in the proximity of other jurisdictions.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located in the proximity of other jurisdictions.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The site is located near the U.S.-Mexico international border. The landfill would be oriented toward, and would not be consistent with, the residential character of the land uses in the neighboring jurisdiction (Country of Mexico) located 0.25-mile to the south. The landfill would not be inconsistent with the designated mixed industrial area in the East Otay Mesa Specific Plan located immediately to the west. However, since this area is located within the same jurisdiction as the landfill, the compatibility with the latter area would not be applicable to this policy.

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
Policy LU-2.8 Mitigation of Development Impacts. Require measures that minimize significant impacts to surrounding areas from uses or operations that cause excessive noise, vibrations, dust, odor, aesthetic impairment and/or are detrimental to human health and safety.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The EIS addressing this alternative analyzes potential noise, vibration, dust, odor, aesthetic, and human health and safety impacts that could occur from the implementation of the alternative. Mitigation measures are recommended in the EIS. In addition, an EIR was certified by the County and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) was adopted for the Gregory Canyon Landfill which sets forth mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts. With the incorporation of these mitigation measures as design features, impacts with respect to noise, vibrations, emissions, dust, and odor would be reduced to less than adverse levels. However, mitigation measures to reduce impacts to natural landform character would not be feasible. Therefore, the alternative would only be partially consistent with this policy.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The EIS addressing this alternative analyzes potential noise, vibration, dust, odor, aesthetic, and human health and safety impacts that could occur from the implementation of the alternative. Mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to a less than adverse level are recommended throughout EIS. However, mitigation measures to reduce impacts to natural landform character would not be feasible. Therefore, the alternative would only be partially consistent with this policy.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The EIS addressing this alternative analyzes potential noise, vibration, dust, odor, aesthetic, and human health and safety impacts that could occur from the implementation of the alternative. Mitigation measures are recommended in the EIS. Mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to a less than adverse level are recommended throughout EIS. However, mitigation measures to reduce impacts to natural landform character would not be feasible. Therefore, the alternative would only be partially consistent with this policy.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The EIS addressing this alternative analyzes potential noise, vibration, dust, odor, aesthetic, and human health and safety impacts that could occur from the implementation of the alternative. Mitigation measures are recommended in the EIS. Mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to a less than adverse level are recommended throughout EIS. However, mitigation measures to reduce impacts to natural landform character would not be feasible. Therefore, the alternative would only be partially consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> The EIS addressing this alternative analyzes potential noise, vibration, dust, odor, aesthetic, and human health and safety impacts that could occur from the implementation of the alternative. Mitigation measures are recommended in the EIS that would reduce impacts to a less than adverse level.
Policy LU-2.9 Maintaining Rural Character. Consider level of service criteria, in accordance with Policy M-2.1, to determine whether adding lanes to a Mobility Element road would adversely impact the rural character of a community or cause significant environmental impacts. In those instances, consider other options to mitigate LOS where appropriate.	<b>Consistent.</b> According to the General Plan, Mobility Element, Table M-4, widening the segment of SR 76 in the vicinity of the site would not be justified. As such, no widening of SR 76 in this area would occur.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> Approximately 2.25 miles of new road from Rainbow Glen Road/Oak Crest Intersection to the site would need to be constructed. Because the area between Rainbow Glen Road and the site is undeveloped, Because of the length of the road through an undeveloped rural area, the construction of the new road has the potential to affect the rural character of the area.	<b>Consistent.</b> Approximately ½ mile of new road from Gopher Canyon Road along the Vista Valley Country Club Golf Course to the site would need to be constructed. Because the area between Gopher Canyon Road and the site is developed with the golf course, it is not rural in character. Therefore, the construction of the new road would not affect the County's rural character.	<b>Consistent.</b> Approximately 0.5 mile of new road from Lawrence Welk Drive to the site would need to be constructed. Although the area between Lawrence Welk Drive and the site is undeveloped and rural in character, because the road would be relatively short, it would not adversely affect the area's rural character.	<b>Consistent.</b> Road improvements to the site would need to be constructed. A new roadway would be constructed between the terminus of Siempre Viva Road and the landfill, in a primarily industrial area. The area between Siempre Viva Road and the landfill is open space not currently accessible via public or private roads. Because the primary character of the area is industrial, road construction would not affect the County's rural character.



TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
GOAL LU-5 Climate Change and Land Use. A land use plan and associated development techniques and patterns that reduce emissions of local greenhouse gases in accordance with state initiatives, while promoting public health.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 4.3, Air Quality and GHG Emissions, of the EIS, the alternative would include design features and mitigation measures that would reduce potential air emissions and local greenhouse gases. In addition, the location of the Gregory Canyon site in North County would provide a proximate disposal site for waste generated in North County, thereby reducing potential GHG emissions compared to trucking waste to more remote landfills..	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 4.3, Air Quality and GHG Emissions, of the EIS, the alternative would include design features and mitigation measures that would reduce potential air emissions and local greenhouse gases. In addition, the location of the Aspen Road property in North County would provide a proximate disposal site for waste generated in North County, thereby reducing potential GHG emissions compared to trucking waste to more remote landfills.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 4.3, Air Quality and GHG Emissions, of the EIS, the alternative would include design features and mitigation measures that would reduce potential air emissions and local greenhouse gases. In addition, the location of the Gopher Canyon Road property in North County would allow closer access to North County's population centers and would provide a proximate disposal site for waste generated in North County, thereby reducing potential GHG emissions compared to trucking waste to more remote landfills.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 4.3, Air Quality and GHG Emissions, of the EIS, the alternative would include design features and mitigation measures that would reduce potential air emissions and local greenhouse gases. In addition, the location of the Merriam Mountain property in North County would provide a proximate disposal site for waste generated in North County, thereby reducing potential GHG emissions compared to trucking waste to more remote landfills.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The purpose of the landfill is to provide disposal capacity for waste generated in North San Diego County. A landfill at East Otay Mesa would provide capacity. However, the location of the landfill in South County would require longer vehicle trips to dispose of North County waste, which would not reduce GHG emissions associated with transportation of waste from North County compared to alternative sites located in North County (see Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, in the EIS).
Policy LU-5.2 Sustainable Planning and Design. Incorporate into new development sustainable planning and design.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate sustainability features, including the use of soil sealants to reduce water demand and a double liner system to protect water quality. In addition to onsite recycling, the proximity of the site to population centers in the north County would reduce total vehicle miles compared to the need to haul North County's solid waste to more distant landfill sites. In addition, permanent open space associated with this alternative would provide carbon sequestration benefits for the region.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate sustainability features, including the use of soil sealants to reduce water demand, a liner system to protect water quality, and onsite recycling. The proximity of the site to population centers in the north County would reduce total vehicle miles compared to the need to haul North County's solid waste to more distant landfill sites.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate sustainability features, including the use of soil sealants to reduce water demand, a liner system to protect water quality, and onsite recycling. The proximity of the site to population centers in the north County would reduce total vehicle miles compared to the need to haul North County's solid waste to more distant landfill sites.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate sustainability features, including the use of soil sealants to reduce water demand, a liner system to protect water quality, and onsite recycling. The proximity of the site to population centers in the north County would reduce total vehicle miles compared to the need to haul North County's solid waste to more distant landfill sites.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> It is expected that the alternative would incorporate sustainability features, including a liner system to protect water quality, and onsite recycling. However, because the purpose of the landfill is to provide disposal capacity for waste generated by jurisdictions in North San Diego County, the location of the alternative site in South County would require longer vehicle trips to dispose of North County waste, which would not support sustainability relative to the purpose of the project. Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, in the EIS discusses the potential for increased GHG related to this alternative.
Policy LU-5.3 Rural Land Preservation. Ensure the preservation of existing open space and rural areas (e.g., forested areas, agricultural lands, wildlife habitat and corridors, wetlands, watersheds, and groundwater recharge areas) when permitting development under the Rural and Semi-Rural Land Use Designations.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is designated as Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility). However, approximately 75 percent of this site (1,313 of 1,753.5 acres) would be permanent open space, which would be in keeping with the rural and semi-rural land uses in the region.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The site is located in an area designated as rural and semi-rural lands. The alternative would involve development of rural land and does not provide a preservation program for undeveloped open space.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The site is located in an area designated as rural and semi-rural lands. The alternative would involve development of rural land and does not provide a preservation program for undeveloped open space.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The site is located in an area designated as rural lands. The alternative would involve development of rural land and does not provide a preservation program for undeveloped open space.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is designated as Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility).

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant’s Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
Policy LU-5.5 Projects that Impede Non-Motorized Travel. Ensure that development projects and road improvements do not impede bicycle and pedestrian access. Where impacts to existing planned routes would occur, ensure that impacts are mitigated and acceptable alternative routes are implemented.	<b>Consistent.</b> Under the alternative, a single point of access (driveway) on SR 76 would be provided. SR 76 would be realigned along approximately 1,700 linear feet to allow turning lanes and improved sight distance. The single point of access would minimize conflicts between haul trucks and potential pedestrian and cyclists on SR 76. No bike lanes are designated along the segment of SR 76 serving the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be designed to reduce conflicts between trucks and non-motorized travel to the extent feasible, including installation of turning lanes from the roadway accessing the site. A new 2.25-mile road to the site would be developed to reduce conflicts between truck traffic and local road users in the area.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be designed to reduce conflicts between trucks and non-motorized travel to the extent feasible, including the use of turning lanes from the public road.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be designed to reduce conflicts between trucks and non-motorized travel to the extent feasible, including the use of turning lanes from the public road.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be designed to reduce conflicts between trucks and non-motorized travel to the extent feasible. However, access from SR 905/SR 125 would be through an industrial park or via future SR 11. The primary use of the access road for waste and delivery trucks indicates a low level of non-motorized activity. No designated bicycle trails are located along the future route from SR 905.
GOAL LU-6 Development - Environmental Balance. A built environment in balance with the natural environment, scarce resources, natural hazards, and the unique local character of individual communities.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed HRRMP and design features described in respective sections of the EIS would support environmental balance to the extent feasible. Additional mitigation presented in the EIS would reduce adverse impacts and help to maintain environmental balance.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed mitigation measures described in respective sections of the Gregory Canyon EIS would support environmental balance to the extent feasible.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed mitigation measures described in respective sections of the Gregory Canyon EIS would support environmental balance to the extent feasible..	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed mitigation measures that require replanting degraded areas with native species would mitigate harm to biological resources. Mitigation measures described in the EIS would protect natural resources and serve to maintain environmental balance. However, this alternative would adversely impact an existing wildlife corridor in the north sector of the site. Therefore, this alternative would be only partially consistent with this goal.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed mitigation measures described in respective sections of the Gregory Canyon EIS would support environmental balance to the extent .feasible. Because impacts to biological resources would remain potentially adverse, this alternative would only be partially consistent with the policy to maintain environmental balance.
Policy LU-6.1 Environmental Sustainability. Require the protection of intact or sensitive natural resources in support of the long-term sustainability of the natural environment.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The site contains Federally-protected and regulated wetlands, Federally regulated watercourses (the San Luis Rey River and Gregory Canyon), oak woodland habitat, native perennial grasslands, coastal sage scrub, and, potentially a golden eagle nesting site. Mitigation measures would protection for any eagles on the site. With the implementation of design features that are incorporated into the Applicant’s Proposed Alternative, the alternative would not significantly impact these resources. In addition, mitigation measures would provide protection for any eagles on the site. Therefore, the development of the alternative would not have an adverse impact on biological resources at the landfill footprint and in some riparian areas. Development has the potential to impact water resources, including the San Luis Rey Rive. To address surface and groundwater pollution, the alternative’s design features and SUSMP, which include	<b>Consistent.</b> The site contains potential Federally-protected wetland and potentially sensitive plant and animal species. Through compliance with the proposed mitigation measures and existing regulations, impacts would not result in a permanent loss of Federally-protected and regulated wetlands or adverse impacts to sensitive species. In addition, as with the Applicant’s Proposed Alternative, this alternative would be required to prepare a SUSMP, which include BMP’s for the control of storm water and other surface water, would be developed consistent with NPDES General Permit provisions specified in the California RWQCB, San Diego Region, Order 2001-01, and NPDES No. CAS0108758- Section F.2, to the satisfaction of the Direct of Public Works. As required by existing water quality control regulations, these plans and respective drainage control systems would reduce the potential	<b>Consistent.</b> The site contains potential Federally-protected wetland and potentially sensitive plant and animal species. Through compliance with the proposed mitigation measures and existing regulations, impacts would not result in a permanent loss of Federally-protected and regulated wetlands or adverse impacts to sensitive species. In addition, as with the Applicant’s Proposed Alternative, this alternative would be required to prepare a SUSMP, which include BMP’s for the control of storm water and other surface water, would be developed consistent with NPDES General Permit provisions specified in the California RWQCB, San Diego Region, Order 2001-01, and NPDES No. CAS0108758- Section F.2, to the satisfaction of the Direct of Public Works. As required by existing water quality control regulations, these plans and respective drainage	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The site contains potential Federally-protected wetland and potentially sensitive plant and animal species. Through compliance with the proposed mitigation measures and existing regulations, impacts would not result in a permanent loss of Federally-protected and regulated wetlands or adverse impacts to sensitive species. In addition, as with the Applicant’s Proposed Alternative, this alternative would be required to prepare a SUSMP, which include BMP’s for the control of storm water and other surface water, would be developed consistent with NPDES General Permit provisions specified in the California RWQCB, San Diego Region, Order 2001-01, and NPDES No. CAS0108758- Section F.2, to the satisfaction of the Direct of Public Works. As required by existing water quality control regulations, these plans and respective drainage control systems would reduce the potential	<b>Consistent.</b> The site contains potential Federally-protected wetland and potentially sensitive plant and animal species. Through compliance with the proposed mitigation measures and existing regulations, impacts would not result in a permanent loss of Federally-protected and regulated wetlands or adverse impacts to sensitive species. In addition, as with the Applicant’s Proposed Alternative, this alternative would be required to prepare a SUSMP, which include BMP’s for the control of storm water and other surface water, would be developed consistent with NPDES General Permit provisions specified in the California RWQCB, San Diego Region, Order 2001-01, and NPDES No. CAS0108758- Section F.2, to the satisfaction of the Direct of Public Works. As required by existing water quality control regulations, these plans and respective drainage control systems would reduce the potential for surface and

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
	BMP's for the control of storm water and other surface water, would be developed consistent with NPDES General Permit provisions specified in the California RWQCB, San Diego Region, Order 2001-01, and NPDES No. CAS0108758- Section F.2, to the satisfaction of the Direct of Public Works. As required by existing water quality control regulations, these plans and respective drainage control systems would reduce the potential for surface and groundwater contamination and erosion. Groundwater contamination would also be avoided through a subdrainage system and the installation of a double composite liner below the landfill that would exceed design standards for Class III solid waste sites as specified in 40 CFR 258.40. A leachate and collection system would be placed over the liner. Because the alternative would be significantly adverse with respect to wetland impacts, it would be only partially consistent with the intent of this policy. (See Sections 4.4, Biological Resources; 4.9, Hydrogeology; and 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS)	for surface and groundwater contamination and erosion. Groundwater contamination would also be avoided through a subdrainage system and the installation of a single composite liner below the landfill that would exceed design standards for Class III solid waste sites as specified in 40 CFR 258.40. A leachate and collection system would be placed over the liner. Because the alternative would not be significantly adverse with respect to the natural biological, surface water, and groundwater resources, it would be consistent with the intent of this policy. .	control systems would reduce the potential for surface and groundwater contamination and erosion. Groundwater contamination would also be avoided through a subdrainage system and the installation of a single composite liner below the landfill that would exceed design standards for Class III solid waste sites as specified in 40 CFR 258.40. A leachate and collection system would be placed over the liner. Because the alternative would not be significantly adverse with respect to the natural biological, surface water, and groundwater resources, it would be consistent with the intent of this policy.	for surface and groundwater contamination and erosion. Groundwater contamination would also be avoided through a subdrainage system and the installation of a single composite liner below the landfill that would exceed design standards for Class III solid waste sites as specified in 40 CFR 258.40. A leachate and collection system would be placed over the liner. However, because the alternative would adversely impact the on-site wildlife corridor, it would only be partially consistent with this policy.	groundwater contamination and erosion. Groundwater contamination would also be avoided through a subdrainage system and the installation of a single composite liner below the landfill that would exceed design standards for Class III solid waste sites as specified in 40 CFR 258.40. A leachate and collection system would be placed over the liner. Because the alternative would not be significantly adverse with respect to natural biological, surface water, and groundwater resources, it would be consistent with the intent of this policy.
Policy LU-6.5 Sustainable Stormwater Management. Ensure that development minimizes the use of impervious surfaces and incorporates other Low Impact Development techniques as well as a combination of site design, source control, and stormwater best management practices, where applicable and consistent with the County's Low Impact Development (LID) Handbook.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would install and monitor extensive temporary and permanent storm water control systems, which would be in place during construction, active site operations and during a minimum of 30 years of post-closure (see Sections 4.9, Hydrogeology and 4.14, Surface Hydrology of the EIS and Sections B.5.4 and C.2.8.3 of the JTD). The alternative's stormwater plans and BMP's would be consistent with the stormwater management and habitat conservation requirements of the County's LID Handbook through the use of water filtration, sedimentation basins, perimeter channels, drainage swales, and filtration areas (stormwater management).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would install and monitor extensive temporary and permanent storm water control systems, which would be in place during construction, active site operations and during a minimum of 30 years of post-closure (see Sections 4.9, Hydrogeology and 4.14, Surface Hydrology of the EIS and Sections B.5.4 and C.2.8.3 of the JTD). The alternative's stormwater plans and BMP's would be consistent with the stormwater management and habitat conservation requirements of the County's LID Handbook through the use of water filtration, sedimentation basins, perimeter channels, drainage swales, and filtration areas (stormwater management).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would install and monitor extensive temporary and permanent storm water control systems, which would be in place during construction, active site operations and during a minimum of 30 years of post-closure (see Sections 4.9, Hydrogeology and 4.14, Surface Hydrology of the EIS and Sections B.5.4 and C.2.8.3 of the JTD). The alternative's stormwater plans and BMP's would be consistent with the stormwater management and habitat conservation requirements of the County's LID Handbook through the use of water filtration, sedimentation basins, perimeter channels, drainage swales, and filtration areas (stormwater management).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would install and monitor extensive temporary and permanent storm water control systems, which would be in place during construction, active site operations and during a minimum of 30 years of post-closure (see Sections 4.9, Hydrogeology and 4.14, Surface Hydrology of the EIS and Sections B.5.4 and C.2.8.3 of the JTD). The alternative's stormwater plans and BMP's would be consistent with the stormwater management and habitat conservation requirements of the County's LID Handbook through the use of water filtration, sedimentation basins, perimeter channels, drainage swales, and filtration areas (stormwater management).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would install and monitor extensive temporary and permanent stormwater control systems, which would be in place during construction, active site operations and during a minimum of 30 years of post-closure (see Sections 4.9, Hydrogeology and 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS). The alternative's stormwater plans and BMP's would be consistent with the stormwater management and habitat conservation requirements of the County's LID Handbook through the use of water filtration, sedimentation basins, perimeter channels, drainage swales, and filtration areas (stormwater management).

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
Policy LU-6.6 Integration of Natural Features into alternative Design. Require incorporation of natural features (including mature oaks, indigenous trees, and rock formations) into proposed development and require avoidance of sensitive environmental resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> All natural vegetation in the landfill footprint, borrow/stockpiles, road, and specific building areas would be removed. The natural landform at the landfill footprint site would be altered and any rock outcroppings within the footprint would be removed. To the extent feasible, the alternative would preserve the property's vegetation and natural rock outcroppings. All rock outcroppings, except those that would cause direct hazard to onsite personnel would be preserved in place. Boulders removed from the hillside would be placed at the base of the landfill or around the ancillary facilities to appear natural-looking. The landfill would be graded to blend to have a more mounded appearance, consistent with natural hillside. Stands of mature trees on the site (not in the landfill or Borrow/Stockpile footprint) would be retained. Facilities and pipes would be painted to blend with the natural setting, and the landfill and Borrow/Stockpile areas would be replanted with native vegetation. Although the landfill alternative would significantly impact the site's native vegetation communities (see Section 4.4, Biological Resources, of the EIS, these impacts would be mitigated through the alternative's HRRMP. The HRRMP would provide for 1,313 acres of permanent habitat/open space.	<b>Consistent.</b> All natural vegetation in the landfill footprint, borrow/stockpiles, road, and specific building areas would be removed. The natural landform at the landfill footprint site would be altered and any rock outcroppings within the footprint would be removed. To the extent feasible, the alternative would preserve the property's vegetation and natural rock outcroppings. All rock outcroppings, except those that would cause direct hazard to onsite personnel would be preserved in place. Boulders removed from the hillside would be placed at the base of the landfill or around the ancillary facilities to appear natural-looking. The landfill would be graded to blend to have a more mounded appearance, consistent with natural hillside. Stands of mature trees on the site (not in the landfill or borrow/stockpile footprint) would be retained. Facilities and pipes would be painted to blend with the natural setting and the landfill and stockpiles would be replanted with native vegetation.	<b>Consistent.</b> All natural vegetation in the landfill footprint, borrow/stockpiles, road, and specific building areas would be removed. The natural landform at the landfill footprint site would be altered and any rock outcroppings within the footprint would be removed. To the extent feasible, the alternative would preserve the property's vegetation and natural rock outcroppings. All rock outcroppings, except those that would cause direct hazard to onsite personnel would be preserved in place. Boulders removed from the hillside would be placed at the base of the landfill or around the ancillary facilities to appear natural-looking. The landfill would be graded to blend to have a more mounded appearance, consistent with natural hillside. Stands of mature trees on the site (not in the landfill or borrow/stockpile footprint) would be retained. Facilities and pipes would be painted to blend with the natural setting and the landfill and stockpiles would be replanted with native vegetation.	<b>Consistent.</b> All natural vegetation in the landfill footprint, borrow/stockpiles, road, and specific building areas would be removed. The natural landform at the landfill footprint site would be altered and any rock outcroppings within the footprint would be removed. To the extent feasible, the alternative would preserve the property's vegetation and natural rock outcroppings. All rock outcroppings, except those that would cause direct hazard to onsite personnel would be preserved in place. Boulders removed from the hillside would be placed at the base of the landfill or around the ancillary facilities to appear natural-looking. The landfill would be graded to blend to have a more mounded appearance, consistent with natural hillside. Stands of mature trees on the site (not in the landfill or borrow/stockpile footprint) would be retained. Facilities and pipes would be painted to blend with the natural setting and the landfill and stockpiles would be replanted with native vegetation.	<b>Consistent.</b> All natural vegetation in the landfill footprint, borrow/stockpiles, road, and specific building areas would be removed. The natural landform at the landfill footprint would be altered and any rock outcroppings within the footprint would be removed. To the extent feasible, the alternative would preserve the property's vegetation and natural rock outcroppings. All rock outcroppings, except those that would cause direct hazard to onsite personnel would be preserved in place. Boulders removed from the hillside would be placed at the base of the landfill or around the ancillary facilities to appear natural-looking. The landfill would be graded to blend to have a more mounded appearance, consistent with natural hillside. Stands of mature trees on the site (not in the landfill or borrow/stockpile footprint) would be retained. Facilities and pipes would be painted to blend with the natural setting, and the landfill and stockpiles would be replanted with native vegetation.
Policy LU-6.7 Open Space Network. Require projects with open space to design contiguous open space areas that protect wildlife habitat and corridors; preserve scenic vistas and areas; and connect with existing or planned recreational opportunities.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would include a 1,313-acre permanent, open space component that would allow for wildlife habitat and corridors. The dedication of open space would allow for a permanent open space corridor along the San Luis Rey River.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The landfill would be located in the central portion of the site and be the dominant land use. Because of the limited size of the property, the alternative would not have the large area of open space associated with the Gregory Canyon site.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The landfill would be located in the central portion of the site and be the dominant land use. Because of the limited size of the property, the alternative would not have the large area of open space associated with the Gregory Canyon site.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The landfill would be located in the central portion of the site and be the dominant land use. Because of the limited size of the property, the alternative would not have the large area of open space associated with the Gregory Canyon site. In addition, this this alternative would adversely impact an existing wildlife corridor in the north section of the site.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The landfill would be located in the central portion of the site and would be the dominant land use. Proposition A requires that approximately 110 acres of open space be provided on the site. However, because of the size of the property established under Proposition A and the configuration of the landfill, open space areas would likely occur around the edge of the site rather than a large contiguous area of open space.

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
Policy LU-6.8 Oversight of Open Space. 1) Retained in private ownership of the property owner or a third party with a restrictive easement that limits use of the land as appropriate; or 2) Require that open space associated with future development that is intended to be preserved in perpetuity either be: Transferred into public ownership of an agency that manages preserved open space. The owner of the open space will be responsible for the maintenance and any necessary management unless those responsibilities are delegated through an adopted plan or agreement. Restrictive easements shall be dedicated to the County or a public agency (approved by the County) with responsibilities that correspond with the purpose of the open space. When transferred to a third party or public agency, a funding mechanism to support the future maintenance and management of the property should be established to the satisfaction of the County.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative's proposed open space component would be held in private ownership and maintained through the Habitat Restoration Plan, and managed by the landfill operators. In accordance with Proposition C, prior to the commencement of the landfill the Applicant shall dedicate 1,313 acres of the site as permanent open space or create a permanent open space easement for long-term preservation of sensitive habitat and species, including coastal sage scrub, coast live oak woodlands, and cottonwood-willow riparian forests. The applicant shall convey or dedicate this land or easement in perpetuity to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Because of the configuration of the landfill in the central portion of the site, the amount of open space that would remain is not likely to be sizeable or valuable enough to be dedicated.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Because of the configuration of the landfill in the central portion of the site, the amount of open space that would remain is not likely to be sizeable or valuable enough to be dedicated.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Because of the configuration of the landfill in the central portion of the site, the amount of open space that would remain is not likely to be sizeable or valuable enough to be dedicated.	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill would use approximately 340 acres of the approximately 450-acre site. The remaining 110 acres (the difference between the total site and the landfill development) could be used as open space. However, there is no commitment to set this acreage aside as permanent habitat or open space.
Policy LU-6.9 Development Conformance with Topography. Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The landfill would alter the physical characteristics of Gregory Canyon. However, benches and lifts along the face of the landfill would be graded to blend with adjacent landforms by manipulating the landform to resemble or meld with its surroundings, planting to create the pattern resembling the adjacent vegetation matrix and its colors, and incorporating boulders into the final grades to create the rocky texture of the surrounding hillsides. Drainage (stormwater) from the landfill site would be controlled to minimize potential contamination of the San Luis Rey River and to eliminate erosion, which is one of the objectives of this policy (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS).	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The landfill would alter the physical characteristics of the Aspen Road property. However, benches and lifts along the face of the landfill would be graded to blend with adjacent landforms by manipulating the landform to resemble or meld with its surroundings, planting to create the pattern resembling the adjacent vegetation matrix and its colors, and incorporating boulders into the final grades to create the rocky texture of the surrounding hillsides. Drainage (stormwater) from the landfill site would be controlled to minimize potential contamination groundwater and to eliminate erosion (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS).	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The landfill would alter the physical characteristics of the Gopher Canyon Road property. However, benches and lifts along the face of the landfill would be graded to blend with adjacent landforms by manipulating the landform to resemble or meld with its surroundings, planting to create the pattern resembling the adjacent vegetation matrix and its colors, and incorporating boulders into the final grades to create the rocky texture of the surrounding hillsides. Drainage (stormwater) from the landfill site would be controlled to minimize potential contamination groundwater and to eliminate erosion (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS).	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The landfill would alter the physical characteristics of the Merriam Mountain property. However, benches and lifts along the face of the landfill would be graded to blend with adjacent landforms by manipulating the landform to resemble or meld with its surroundings, planting to create the pattern resembling the adjacent vegetation matrix and its colors, and incorporating boulders into the final grades to create the rocky texture of the surrounding hillsides. Drainage (stormwater) from the landfill site would be controlled to minimize potential contamination groundwater and to eliminate erosion (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS).	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The landfill would alter the physical characteristics of the East Otay Mesa property. However, benches and lifts along the face of the landfill would be graded to blend with adjacent landforms by manipulating the landform to resemble or meld with its surroundings, planting to create the pattern resembling the adjacent vegetation matrix and its colors, and incorporating boulders into the final grades to create the rocky texture of the surrounding hillsides. Drainage (stormwater) from the landfill site would be controlled to minimize potential contamination groundwater and to eliminate erosion (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS).

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy LU-6.10 Protection from Hazards. Require that development be located and designed to protect property and residents from the risks of natural and man-induced hazards.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative must comply with regulatory requirements that are in place to protect human health. In addition, the alternative would incorporate design features to minimize potential impacts to human health and safety, including rock fall hazard, landfill gas, and water quality (installation of a double liner to protect ground water and water sedimentation basins, perimeter channels drainage swales, and filtration areas to protect rivers).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative must comply with regulatory requirements that are in place to protect human health. In addition, the alternative would incorporate design features to minimize potential impacts to human health and safety, including rock fall hazard, landfill gas, and water quality (the alternative would meet the 40 CFR, 258.40 for the protection of groundwater and surface water quality).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative must comply with regulatory requirements that are in place to protect human health. In addition, the alternative would incorporate design features to minimize potential impacts to human health and safety, including rock fall hazard, landfill gas, and water quality (the alternative would meet the 40 CFR, 258.40 for the protection of groundwater and surface water quality).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative must comply with regulatory requirements that are in place to protect human health. In addition, the alternative would incorporate design features to minimize potential impacts to human health and safety, including rock fall hazard, landfill gas, and water quality (the alternative would meet the 40 CFR, 258.40 for the protection of groundwater and surface water quality).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative must comply with regulatory requirements that are in place to protect human health. In addition, the alternative would incorporate design features to minimize potential impacts to human health and safety, including rock fall hazard, landfill gas, and water quality (the alternative would meet the 40 CFR, 258.40 for the protection of groundwater and surface water quality).
Policy LU-6.11 Protection from Wildfires and Unmitigable Hazards. Assign land uses and densities in a manner that minimizes development in extreme, very high and high fire threat areas or other unmitigable hazardous areas.	<b>Consistent.</b> According to the General Plan Conservation Element, "the majority of the unincorporated County is classified as High or Very High fire risk." To reduce potential wildfire, design features incorporated into the alternative include no burning of refuse, firebreaks of 150 feet around the perimeters of the landfill, application of daily and immediate cover, load checking for smoldering or burning waste, monitoring temperatures of monitoring wells, and other measures outlined in Section 4.12.2, of the EIS.	<b>Consistent.</b> Fire safety-related design features, similar to those incorporated in the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, would be implemented to reduce potential wildfire hazard.	<b>Consistent.</b> Fire safety-related design features, similar to those incorporated in the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, would be implemented to reduce potential wildfire hazard.	<b>Consistent.</b> Fire safety-related design features, similar to those incorporated in the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, would be implemented to reduce potential wildfire hazard.	<b>Consistent.</b> Fire safety-related design features, similar to those incorporated in the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, would be implemented to reduce potential wildfire hazard.
GOAL LU-7 Agricultural Conservation. A land use plan that retains and protects farming and agriculture as beneficial resources that contribute to the County's rural character.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is designated for use as a landfill and is not used for farming or agriculture. The site does not contain FMMP-designated Farmland of Statewide, Unique, or Local Importance. No agricultural preservation or conservation areas are contained within the site.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> A portion of the site is designated as an Agricultural Conservation area and such uses would be precluded with development of a landfill.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The Gopher Canyon Road property is not being used for farming or agriculture and is not specifically designated to protect such uses. The site does not contain FMMP-designated Farmland of Statewide, Unique, or Local Importance. No agricultural preservation or conservation areas are contained within the site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The Gopher Canyon Road property is not being used for farming or agriculture and is not specifically designated to protect such uses. The site does not contain FMMP-designated Farmland of Statewide, Unique, or Local Importance. No agricultural preservation or conservation areas are contained within the site.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> A portion of the site is designated FMMP as Farmland of Local Importance. However, while the alternative would preclude the use of the designated area for farming, the SWF zoning does not anticipate the continued use of the site for farming. The alternative would not adversely affect any surrounding agricultural operations.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy LU-7.1 Agricultural Land Development. Protect agricultural lands with lower-density land use designations that support continued agricultural operations.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is designated as Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility) and is not an agricultural site. The site does not contain FMMP-designated Farmland of Statewide, Unique, or Local Importance. No agricultural preservation or conservation areas are contained within the site.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The Aspen Road property is designated as Rural Lands, which allows agricultural uses, and a section of the property is within an agricultural conservation contract area. A landfill would not be consistent with the agricultural purpose.	<b>Consistent.</b> Portions of the Gopher Canyon Road property are designated as Rural Lands, which allows agricultural uses; however, the property is not being used for agricultural purposes. The site does not contain FMMP-designated Farmland of Statewide, Unique, or Local Importance. No agricultural preservation or conservation areas are contained within the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> Portions of the Merriam Mountain property are designated as Rural Lands, which allows agricultural uses; however, the property is not being used for agricultural purposes. The site does not contain FMMP-designated Farmland of Statewide, Unique, or Local Importance. No agricultural preservation or conservation areas are contained within the site.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The site is designated as Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility), the purpose of which is the future use of the site as a landfill (which would preclude agricultural uses). However, a portion of the site is designated as Farmland of Local Importance and the alternative would not be consistent with the policy to protect agricultural lands.
Policy LU-7.2 Parcel Size Reduction as Incentive for Agriculture. Allow for reductions in lot size for compatible development when tracts of existing historically agricultural land are preserved in conservation easements for continued agricultural use.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is designated as Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility) and is not an agricultural site.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> A section of the Aspen Road property is designated as an agricultural preserve. The alternative landfill would not be consistent with the agricultural purpose.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Portions of the Gopher Canyon Road property are designated as Rural Lands, which allows agricultural uses; however, the property has not been used for agricultural purposes and may not be suitable for agricultural use.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The Merriam Mountain property is designated as Rural Lands, which allows agricultural uses; however, the property has not been used for agricultural purposes and may not be suitable for agricultural use.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> No conservation easements occur on the site.
GOAL LU-8 Aquifers and Groundwater Conservation. Sustainable aquifers and functional groundwater recharge areas.	<b>Consistent.</b> The effects of the alternative on groundwater resources are addressed in Section 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS. Implementation of the alternative's design features, including the use of a double liner system and the mandatory Evaluation Monitoring Program (EMP) and Corrective Action Program (CAP) under the regulatory guidance of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (by Sections 20425 and 20430 of Title 27 of the CCR), as well as mitigation measures to ensure monitoring and corrective action procedures, would support the goal of sustainable aquifers and functional groundwater recharge.	<b>Consistent.</b> The effects of the alternative on groundwater resources are addressed in 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS. Implementation of design features, including the use of a liner system consistent with 40 CFR, 258.40 requirements, and the mandatory Evaluation Monitoring Program (EMP) and Corrective Action Program (CAP) under the regulatory guidance of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (by Sections 20425 and 20430 of Title 27 of the CCR), as well as mitigation measures to ensure monitoring and corrective action procedures would support the goal of sustainable aquifers and functional groundwater recharge.	<b>Consistent.</b> The effects of the alternative on groundwater resources are addressed in 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS. Implementation of this design features, including the use of a liner system consistent with 40 CFR, 258.40 requirements, and the mandatory Evaluation Monitoring Program (EMP) and Corrective Action Program (CAP) under the regulatory guidance of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (by Sections 20425 and 20430 of Title 27 of the CCR), as well as mitigation measures to ensure monitoring and corrective action procedures would support the goal of sustainable aquifers and functional groundwater recharge.	<b>Consistent.</b> The effects of the alternative on groundwater resources are addressed in Section 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS. Implementation of this design features, including the use of a liner system consistent with 40 CFR, 258.40 requirements, and the mandatory Evaluation Monitoring Program (EMP) and Corrective Action Program (CAP) under the regulatory guidance of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (by Sections 20425 and 20430 of Title 27 of the CCR), as well as mitigation measures to ensure monitoring and corrective action procedures would support the goal of sustainable aquifers and functional groundwater recharge.	<b>Consistent.</b> The effects of the alternative on groundwater resources are addressed in Section 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS. Implementation of the design features, including the use of a liner system consistent with 40 CFR, 258.40 requirements, and the mandatory Evaluation Monitoring Program (EMP) and Corrective Action Program (CAP) under the regulatory guidance of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (by Sections 20425 and 20430 of Title 27 of the CCR), as well as mitigation measures to ensure monitoring and corrective action procedures would support the goal of sustainable aquifers and functional groundwater recharge.
Policy LU-8.1 Density Relationship to Groundwater Sustainability. Require land use densities in groundwater dependent areas to be consistent with the long-term sustainability of groundwater supplies, except in the Borrego Valley.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative does not have a residential component or other component related to urban density. As with the prior domestic and agricultural use of the site, well water would be used in construction and operation of the landfill. The landfill's water demand is expected to be less than historic use on the site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Groundwater supplies are not available on the site and the site would likely be served by municipal water. Therefore, the alternative would not use well water for construction or operation.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative does not have a residential component or other component related to urban density. As with the prior domestic and agricultural use of the site, well water would be used in construction and operation of the landfill. The landfill's water demand is expected to be less than historic use on the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative does not have a residential component or other component related to urban density. As with the prior domestic and agricultural use of the site, well water would be used in construction and operation of the landfill. The landfill's water demand is expected to be less than historic use on the site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Groundwater supplies are not available on the site and the site would likely be served by municipal water. Therefore, the alternative would not use well water for construction or operation.



**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy LU-8.2 Groundwater Resources. In areas dependent on currently identified groundwater overdrafted basins, prohibit new development from exacerbating overdraft conditions. Encourage programs to alleviate overdraft conditions in Borrego Valley. Require development to identify adequate groundwater resources in groundwater dependent areas, as follows: In areas without current overdraft groundwater conditions, evaluate new groundwater dependent development to assure a sustainable long-term supply of groundwater is available that will not adversely impact existing groundwater users.	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The site is not located within the Borrego Valley Aquifer. However, design features that require ongoing safe yield verification of groundwater resources and evaluation of alluvial groundwater capture would ensure that groundwater extracted from bedrock wells would not draw groundwater from the alluvial aquifer. If drawdown is measured in the adjacent alluvial observation wells during the pumping test, the pumping rate would be adjusted so that no measurable drawdown is indicated in these alluvial observation wells.</p> <p>Additional design features described in Section 4.9, Hydrogeology, and 4.16.1, Water Supply, of the EIS would reduce impacts to groundwater resources to a less than adverse level.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> Due to the limited presence of groundwater underlying the Aspen Road Alternative site, groundwater would not be used in the initial construction, operation, and closure of the Aspen Road Alternative. Therefore, the Aspen Road Alternative would not withdraw underlying groundwater and the alternative would not result in an adverse effect with respect to groundwater supplies in the area.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> Groundwater underlying the Gopher Canyon Road Alternative site would likely be used in the initial construction, operation, and closure of the landfill. As discussed above and similar to the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, the Gopher Canyon Road Alternative would include design features to maintain a safe yield of groundwater and prevent overdraft from the hydrologic subarea. A safe yield from the subarea would be accomplished through the installation of totalizer meters and level controls with automatic shut-off switches in on-site groundwater wells. The level controls would automatically shut down a well if drawdown exceeds the calculated sustainable yield of the well. The settings for the level control would be determined through pump testing and a sustainable yield calculation. As the Gopher Canyon Road Alternative would maintain a safe yield of underlying groundwater resources, the alternative would not result in a significant adverse effect with regard to the production capacity of off-site wells or the beneficial needs of other groundwater users in the Basin.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> Groundwater underlying the Merriam Mountain Alternative site would likely be used in the initial construction, operation, and closure of the landfill. Similar to the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, the Merriam Mountain Alternative would include design features to maintain a safe yield of groundwater and prevent overdraft of supplies. Safe yield would be accomplished through the installation of totalizer meters and level controls with automatic shut-off switches in on-site groundwater wells. The level controls would automatically shut down a well if drawdown exceeds the calculated sustainable yield of the well. The settings for the level control would be determined through pump testing and a sustainable yield calculation.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The use of groundwater is not expected. However, development of the landfill would alter the groundwater setting. Because of the limited presence of groundwater underlying the site, in combination with the subdrain system that would be installed in accordance with applicable regulations, the natural flow of the limited underlying groundwater would be maintained.</p>
Policy LU-8.3 Groundwater-Dependent Habitat. Discourage development that would significantly draw down the groundwater table to the detriment of groundwater-dependent habitat.	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would not significantly draw down the groundwater table. Any well water used would be monitored to ensure that bedrock wells would not draw groundwater from the alluvial aquifer.</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable.</b> The use of well water is not anticipated.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> A safe yield from the subarea would be accomplished through the installation of totalizer meters and level controls with automatic shut-off switches in on-site groundwater wells.</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable.</b> A safe yield from the subarea would be accomplished through the installation of totalizer meters and level controls with automatic shut-off switches in on-site groundwater wells.</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable.</b> The use of well water is not anticipated.</p>
GOAL LU-10, "Function of Semi-Rural and Rural Lands. Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that buffer communities, protect natural resources, foster agriculture, and accommodate unique rural communities" and Policies LU-10.1 through 10.4 apply specifically to Semi-Rural and Rural Land use designations.	<p><b>Not Applicable.</b> Although the site is located in a mixed use area of rural, commercial, and extractive uses, the site is designated and zoned Public/Semi-Public Land (SWF), and not designated as Semi-Rural or Rural.</p>	<p><b>Not Consistent.</b> The Aspen Road property is located in a predominantly rural area, which is designated as Rural Lands and Semi-Rural Lands. The landfill use would not be consistent with the rural designation and zoning of the property.</p>	<p><b>Not Consistent.</b> The Gopher Canyon Road property is located in a predominantly rural/semi-rural area, and contains sections that are designated Rural and Semi-Rural Lands. The use of the property for a landfill would not be consistent with the rural/semi-rural designation or zoning of the property.</p>	<p><b>Not Consistent.</b> The Merriam Mountain property is located in a predominantly rural area and designated as Rural Lands. The landfill use would not be consistent with the rural designation and zoning of the property.</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is designated and zoned Public/Semi-Public Land (SWF), and not designated as Semi-Rural or Rural.</p>



**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
GOAL LU-11, "Commercial, Office, and Industrial Development. Policies. Commercial, office, and industrial development that is appropriately sited and designed to enhance the unique character of each unincorporated community and to minimize vehicle trip lengths," and Policies LU-11.1 through 11.11 apply to the commercial, office, and industrial development and land use designations.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although not strictly considered an industrial use under the County Code's land use designations, the landfill would serve an industrial/commercial purpose in providing waste disposal. Because the purpose of the landfill is to provide disposal capacity for waste generated in north San Diego County, the landfill, which would be located in the North County, would minimize vehicle mile trip lengths compared to the need to travel to more remote landfills in the Central and South County.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although not strictly considered an industrial use under the County Code's land use designations, the landfill would serve an industrial/commercial purpose in providing waste disposal. Because the purpose of the landfill is to provide disposal capacity for waste generated in north San Diego County, the landfill, which would be located in the North County, would minimize vehicle mile trip lengths compared to the need to travel to more remote landfills in the Central and South County.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although not strictly considered an industrial use under the County Code's land use designations, the landfill would serve an industrial/ commercial purpose in providing waste disposal. Because the purpose of the landfill is to provide disposal capacity for waste generated in North San Diego County, the landfill, which would be located in the North County, would minimize vehicle mile trip lengths compared to the need to travel to more remote landfills in the Central and South County.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although not strictly considered an industrial use under the County Code's land use designations, the landfill would serve an industrial/commercial purpose in providing waste disposal. Because the purpose of the landfill is to provide disposal capacity for waste generated in North San Diego County, the landfill, which would be located in the North County, would minimize vehicle mile trip lengths compared to the need to travel to more remote landfills in the Central and South County.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> Although not strictly considered an industrial use under the County Code's land use designations, the landfill would serve an industrial/commercial purpose in providing waste disposal. However, because the purpose of the landfill is to provide disposal capacity for waste generated in North San Diego County, the landfill, which would be located in South County, would not be sited to minimize vehicle mile trip lengths for waste hauled from North County.
GOAL LU-12. Infrastructure and Services Supporting Development. Adequate and sustainable infrastructure, public facilities, and essential services that meet community needs and are provided concurrent with growth and development and Policies LU-12.1 through LU-12.4 apply to infrastructure (such as streets and highways) and services supporting development.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide solid waste services concurrent with growth and development in north San Diego County.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide solid waste services concurrent with growth and development in north San Diego County.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide solid waste services concurrent with growth and development in north San Diego County.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide solid waste services concurrent with growth and development in north San Diego County.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide solid waste services concurrent with growth and development in San Diego County.
LU-12.1 Concurrency of Infrastructure and Services with Development. Require the provision of infrastructure, facilities, and services needed by new development prior to that development, either directly or through fees. Where appropriate, the construction of infrastructure and facilities may be phased to coincide with alternative phasing.	<b>Consistent.</b> This alternative would provide a solid waste disposal site in compliance with the County's Siting Element to ensure adequate landfill capacity is available to support future demand.	<b>Consistent.</b> This alternative would provide a solid waste disposal site in the County to ensure adequate landfill capacity is available to support future demand.	<b>Consistent.</b> This alternative would provide a solid waste disposal site in the County to ensure adequate landfill capacity is available to support future demand.	<b>Consistent.</b> This alternative would provide a solid waste disposal site in the County to ensure adequate landfill capacity is available to support future demand.	<b>Consistent.</b> This alternative would provide a solid waste disposal site in the County to ensure adequate landfill capacity is available to support future demand.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
LU-12.2 Maintenance of Adequate Services. Require development to mitigate significant impacts to existing service levels of public facilities or services for existing residents and businesses. Provide improvements for Mobility Element roads in accordance with the Mobility Element Network Appendix matrices, which may result in ultimate build-out conditions that achieve an improved LOS but do not achieve a LOS of D or better.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would increase service levels (LOS) to greater than D on SR 76 under the General Plan's Mobility Plan, which retains SR 76 at two lanes (single lane in each direction). However, with the proposed mitigation, impacts with respect to service levels on SR 76 would not be significant.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would impact service levels at Mission Road/I-15 ramps/Mountain Meadow and Mission Road segments, which would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of mitigation measures (see Section 4.15, Transportation, of the EIS).	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The Gopher Canyon Road Alternative would add new traffic to the roadway network. The trips would have the greatest impacts between the landfill access road and the I-15 ramps, which would be accessed via Lawrence Welk Drive and Champagne Boulevard. The trip distribution through traffic facilities analyzed under the Near-Term Conditions scenario would result in new cumulative traffic contributions that could result in adverse cumulative effects at six intersections and four roadway segments. Mitigation measures could reduce adverse effects to less than significant levels; however, such measures would need to be implemented via the TIF program at the discretion of the County. Since, their implementation is not certain, and they may not be implemented prior to the significant adverse effects occurring, it is concluded that the adverse cumulative effects could potentially remain significant.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would impact service levels at the Champagne Boulevard/Mountain Meadow and Deer Springs Road/I-15 intersections and segments of Deer Springs Road, which would be addressed through implementation of mitigation measures (see Section 4.15, Transportation, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would impact service levels at the Siempré Viva and SR 905 interchange, intersections and segments of Deer Springs Road, which would be addressed through implementation of mitigation measures (see Section 4.15, Transportation, of the EIS).
LU-12.3 Infrastructure and Services Compatibility. Provide public facilities and services that are sensitive to the environment with characteristics of the unincorporated communities. Encourage the collocation of infrastructure facilities, where appropriate.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide solid waste disposal services and incorporate design features to reduce environmental impacts, including the dedication of 1,313 acres of the site as permanent open space or as a permanent open space easement for long-term preservation of sensitive habitat and species. In addition, the site includes easements for SDG&E high voltage electrical transmission line and buried pipelines of the San Diego Aqueduct. Impacts associated with the potential relocation of the pipeline and relocation of the power lines would be mitigated to a less than significant level. The location of these facilities within the Gregory Canyon property and in proximity to a privately-owned power generation plant (approximately 0.25 mile to the northeast of the property) would represent a collocation of infrastructure facilities.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide solid waste disposal services and implement mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts. An eight-inch water line belonging to the Rainbow Municipal Water District (RMWD) lies below the property. This line would be relocated depending on the location of the landfill footprint. Otherwise, the property is not designated for other public services.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide solid waste disposal services and implement mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts. The property is partially designated for public service facilities (communications/transportation facilities).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide solid waste disposal services and implement mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts. The property does not contain a mix of other public service facilities and is not designated for public service facilities.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide solid waste disposal services and implement mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts. The property is not designated for other public service facilities.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
LU-12.4 Planning for Compatibility. Plan and site infrastructure for public utilities and public facilities in a manner compatible with community character, minimize visual and environmental impacts, and whenever feasible, locate any facilities and supporting infrastructure outside preserve areas. Require context sensitive Mobility Element road design that is compatible with community character and minimizes visual and environmental impacts; for Mobility Element roads identified in Table M-4, an LOS D or better may not be achieved.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would mitigate visual, biological, and traffic impacts to the extent feasible as described in the EIS (see Sections 4.1, Aesthetics, 4.4, Biological Resources, 4.15, Transportation). In addition, the site is directly accessed via an existing highway (SR 76) and I-15. However, because the General Plan's Mobility Plan, would retain SR 76 at two lanes (single lane in each direction), this alternative would increase service levels (LOS) to greater than D on SR 76 under the Mobility Element. All roadway improvement areas would be landscaped with native trees or other vegetation.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would mitigate visual, biological, and traffic impacts to the extent feasible as described in the EIS (see Sections 4.1, Aesthetics, 4.4, Biological Resources, and 4.15, Transportation).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would mitigate visual, biological, and traffic impacts to the extent feasible as described in the EIS (see Sections 4.1, Aesthetics, 4.4, Biological Resources, 4.15, Transportation).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would mitigate visual, biological, and traffic impacts to the extent feasible as described in the EIS (see Sections 4.1, Aesthetics, 4.4, Biological Resources, 4.15, Transportation).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would mitigate visual, biological, and traffic impacts to the extent feasible as described in the EIS (see Sections 4.1, Aesthetics, 4.4, Biological Resources, 4.15, Transportation).
LU 13 Adequate Water Quality, Supply, and Protection. A balanced and regionally integrated water management approach to ensure the long-term viability of San Diego County's water quality and supply.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site has adequate onsite water to serve the landfill operation. Although the need to use imported recycled water is not anticipated, this alternative includes a contingency plan to import recycled water in the event of a shortfall. In addition, this alternative would protect water resources in the San Luis Rey River through implementation of water quality control measures, such as capture of runoff, double lining, desilting ponds, and other measures (see Sections 4.9, Hydrogeology, and 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> No groundwater supplies that would support landfill operations are located near the Aspen Road site. However, an eight-inch RMWD services the area and water from this municipal source would be available. The alternative would implement water quality control measures, as described in 4.9, Hydrogeology, and 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Gopher Canyon Road property is located within the service area of the RMWD and Vallecitos Water District. The RMWD allows the use of groundwater as well as municipal water sources that would support landfill operations. The alternative would implement water quality control measures, as described in 4.9, Hydrogeology, and 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Merriam Mountain property is located within the service area of the Vallecitos Water District, which provided municipal water to the area. Therefore, the landfill operation would be supported by available municipal sources. The alternative would implement water quality control measures, as described in 4.9, Hydrogeology, and 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS.	<b>Consistent.</b> The East Otay Mesa property is located partially within the service area of the Otay Water District (OWD), which provides municipal water to the area. Therefore, the landfill operation would be supported by available municipal sources. The alternative would implement water quality control measures, as described in Sections 4.9, Hydrogeology, and 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS.
LU-13.1 Adequacy of Water Supply. Coordinate water infrastructure planning with land use planning to maintain an acceptable availability of a high quality sustainable water supply. Ensure that new development includes both indoor and outdoor water conservation measures to reduce demand. .	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would not affect the potential relocation of the San Diego Aqueduct Pipelines 1 and 2 which cross this site in an existing easement. No municipal water lines serve the site or are planned.	<b>Consistent.</b> The RMWD's eight-inch line passes through the property in an existing easement. Relocation of the line may be required. With the relocation, the alternative would not affect the adequacy of this system.	<b>Consistent.</b> No regional water lines pass through the property. Therefore, this alternative would not affect water supply infrastructure.	<b>Consistent.</b> No regional water lines pass through the property. Therefore, this alternative would not affect water supply infrastructure.	<b>Consistent.</b> No regional water lines pass through the property. Therefore, this alternative would not affect water supply infrastructure.
LU-13.2 Commitment of Water Supply. Require new development to identify adequate water resources, in accordance with State law, to support the development prior to approval	<b>Consistent.</b> The site has onsite water resources (well water) to serve construction and operation of the proposed landfill. Withdrawal of onsite water would not affect offsite water tables or aquifers (see Section 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is served by municipal water that would serve construction and operation of the proposed landfill (see Section 4.16.1, Water Supply, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is served by municipal water that would serve construction and operation of the proposed landfill (see Section 4.16.1, Water Supply, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is served by municipal water that would serve construction and operation of the proposed landfill (see Section 4.16.1, Water Supply, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is served by municipal water that would serve construction and operation of the proposed landfill (see Section 4.16.1, Water Supply, of the EIS).

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
GOAL LU-16 Appropriately Sited Waste Management Facilities. Solid waste management facilities that are appropriately located and sited in a manner that minimizes environmental impacts and potential conflicts from incompatible land uses, while facilitating recycling and resource recovery activities.	<b>Consistent.</b> The facility is located on a site designated as Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility). It is accessible to the North County's population centers which it is intended to serve, and convenient to I-15 (3.6 miles via SR 76). Because the purpose of the landfill is to provide disposal capacity for waste generated in North San Diego County, the site is appropriately sited to minimize GHG impacts associated with vehicle trips, compared to longer trips to Central and South County locations. The alternative would not conflict with the land use character of the area, which is a mix of residential, industrial, and agricultural uses. With regard to the proximity of the San Luis Rey River, implementation of the alternative's design features and SUSMP, which include BMP's for the control of storm water and other surface water, would occur in compliance with applicable requirements. As required by existing water quality control regulations, design features, BMPs, and respective drainage control systems would reduce the potential for surface and groundwater contamination and erosion and, therefore, not adversely affect the river (see Sections 4.9, Hydrogeology, and 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS).	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The site is accessible to the North County's population centers, and convenient to I-15. Because the purpose of the landfill is to provide disposal capacity for waste generated in North San Diego County, the site is appropriately sited to minimize GHG impacts associated with vehicle trips, compared to longer trips to Central and South County locations. However, the landfill in this location would potentially conflict with rural residential character of the area. The landfill in this location would potentially conflict with rural residential character of the area.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The site is accessible to the North County's population centers. Because the purpose of the landfill is to provide disposal capacity for waste generated in North San Diego County, the site is appropriately sited to minimize GHG impacts associated with vehicle trips, compared to longer trips to Central and South County locations. However, the landfill in this location would potentially conflict with adjoining rural residential and recreational uses.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is accessible to the North County's population centers, and convenient to I-15. Because the purpose of the landfill is to provide disposal capacity for waste generated in North San Diego County, the site is appropriately sited to minimize GHG impacts associated with vehicle trips, compared to longer trips to Central and South County locations. The landfill in this location would not necessarily conflict with the rural setting because of its distance from adjacent residential uses.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> Because the purpose of the landfill is to provide disposal capacity for waste generated in North San Diego County, the location of the landfill in South County would require longer vehicle trips to dispose of North County waste, which would not minimize GHG emissions associated with transportation of waste from North County compared to alternatives in closer proximity to North County (see Section 4.2, Air Quality and GHG, in the EIS). However, the landfill in this location would not conflict with the land use character of the area, which is a mix of industrial and agricultural uses.
Policy LU-16.1 Location of Waste Management Facilities. Site new solid waste management facilities identified in the San Diego County Integrated Waste Management Plan, in a manner that minimizes environmental impacts and prevents groundwater degradation, and in accordance with applicable local land use policies.	<b>Consistent.</b> Design features incorporated into the alternative would minimize environmental impacts. Section 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS, determines that with the incorporation design features and Federal, State, and RWQCB requirements, including the implementation of environmental control systems and a groundwater monitoring network, groundwater would not be degraded.	<b>Consistent.</b> Design features incorporated into the alternative would minimize environmental impacts. Section 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS, determines that with the incorporation design features and Federal, State, and RWQCB requirements, including the implementation of environmental control systems and a groundwater monitoring network, groundwater would not be degraded.	<b>Consistent.</b> Design features incorporated into the alternative would minimize environmental impacts. Section 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS, determines that with the incorporation design features and Federal, State, and RWQCB requirements, including the implementation of environmental control systems and a groundwater monitoring network, groundwater would not be degraded.	<b>Consistent.</b> Design features incorporated into the alternative would minimize environmental impacts. Section 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS, determines that with the incorporation design features and Federal, State, and RWQCB requirements, including the implementation of environmental control systems and a groundwater monitoring network, groundwater would not be degraded.	<b>Consistent.</b> Design features incorporated into the alternative would minimize environmental impacts. Section 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS, determines that with the incorporation design features and Federal, State, and RWQCB requirements, including the implementation of environmental control systems and a groundwater monitoring network, groundwater would not be degraded.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy LU-16.2 Integrity of Waste Management Facilities. Avoid encroachment of incompatible land uses upon solid waste facilities in order to minimize or avoid potential conflicts.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal is directed toward County planners regarding zoning or land use designations to protect a solid waste site from encroachment. However, the existing zoning and designation of Public/Semi Public Land is specific to landfill development and intended to protect waste facility sites from encroachment by development of incompatible uses.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The land use designation and zoning of the Aspen Road property and surrounding properties as Rural Lands (RL20), Rural Lands (RL-40) and Semi-Rural Lands (SR-2) would not protect the site from encroachment of incompatible uses.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The land use designation and zoning of the Gopher Canyon Road property and surrounding properties as Specific Plan Area, Rural Lands (RL20), Semi-Rural Residential, (SR-4), would not protect the site from encroachment of incompatible uses.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The land use designation and zoning of the Merriam Mountain property and surrounding properties as Rural Lands (RL-20) would not protect the site from encroachment of incompatible uses.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal is directed toward County planners regarding zoning or land use designations to protect a solid waste site from encroachment. The existing zoning and designation of Public/Semi Public Land is specific to landfill development and intended to protect waste facility sites from encroachment by development of incompatible uses.
Policy LU-16.3 New Waste Management Facilities. Encourage the establishment of additional recycling and resource recovery facilities in areas with Industrial land use designations.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal is directed toward the County to encourage establishment of recycling facilities in industrial areas. The property is designated Public/Semi Public Land (Solid Waste Facility), which allows for recycling and the alternative includes recycling facilities.	<b>Consistent.</b> If the zoning of the site were changed to allow a landfill, a recycling component would be provided.	<b>Consistent.</b> If the zoning of the site were changed to allow a landfill, a recycling component would be provided.	<b>Consistent.</b> If the zoning of the site were changed to allow a landfill, a recycling component would be provided.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal is directed toward the County to encourage establishment of recycling facilities in industrial areas. The property is designated Public/Semi Public Land (Solid Waste Facility), which allows for recycling and the alternative includes recycling facilities.
<b>CHAPTER 4 MOBILITY ELEMENT</b>					
GOAL M-2 Responding to Physical Constraints and Preservation Goals. A road network that provides adequate capacity to reasonably accommodate both planned land uses and regional traffic patterns, while supporting other General Plan goals such as providing environmental protections and enhancing community character.	<b>Consistent.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding road network capacity. Design features, including improvements to SR 76 at the access road, including deceleration lanes and a signal, would maintain roadway capacity without affecting regional traffic patterns or environmental character. Landscaping of highway shoulders at the improvement site is a design feature of the alternative.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement roadway improvements to maintain adequate service levels at the I-15 interchange and along Rainbow Glen Road. Landscaping of highway shoulders at the improvement site would be implemented as required by state or county transportation departments.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement roadway improvements to maintain adequate service levels at the I-15 interchange and along Gopher Canyon Road, which provide regional and local access to the site. Landscaping of highway shoulders at the improvement site would be implemented as required by state or county transportation departments.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement roadway improvements to maintain adequate service levels at the I-15 interchange and along Champagne Boulevard and Lawrence Welk Drive, which provide regional and local access to the site. Landscaping of highway shoulders at the improvement site would be implemented as required by state or county transportation departments.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement roadway improvements to maintain adequate service levels at the SR-905 and Siempre Viva Road interchange, which would provide regional and local access to the site. Landscaping of highway shoulders at the improvement site would be implemented as required by state or county transportation departments.
Policy M-2.1 Level of Service Criteria. Require development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve a level of service of “D” or higher on all Mobility Element roads except for those where a failing level of service has been accepted by the County pursuant to the criteria specifically identified in the accompanying text box (Criteria for Accepting a Road Classification with Level of Service E/F). When development is proposed on roads where a failing level of service has been accepted, require feasible mitigation in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to a road improvement program, consistent with the Mobility Element road network.	<b>Consistent.</b> With the implementation of design features, including improvements to SR 76, maintaining a maximum of 673 total trucks per day, and compliance with peak hour restrictions described in Section 4.15, Transportation, of the EIS, direct impacts to street segments would not exceed acceptable threshold levels. Cumulative service levels at buildout conditions would exceed significance criteria at SR 76 between Couser Canyon and the site's access road. Design features including the installation of a signal and payment of a Transportation Impact Fee (fee) for improvements that would maintain acceptable roadway service levels (see Section 4.15, Transportation, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement roadway improvements to maintain adequate service levels at the I-15 interchange and along Rainbow Glen Road, which provide regional and local access to the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement roadway improvements to maintain adequate service levels at the I-15 interchange and along Gopher Canyon Road, which provide regional and local access to the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement roadway improvements to maintain adequate service levels at the I-15 interchange and along Champagne Boulevard and Lawrence Welk Drive, which provide regional and local access to the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement roadway improvements to maintain adequate service levels at the SR-905 and Siempre Viva Road interchange, which would provide regional and local access to the site.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy M-2.2 Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads. Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.	<b>Consistent.</b> In accordance with Policy M2-2, the alternative would provide one point of access from SR 76. The intersection would be signalized and approximately 1,700 linear feet on SR 76 at the access road would be improved to realign and widen the roadway. The improvements include the provision of an eastbound deceleration lane and a westbound left turn lane. The proposed improvements would provide adequate sight distance per Caltrans requirements and, as such, minimize potential impacts. As such, the alternative would be consistent with this policy to maintain capacity and improve traffic operations on designated roads.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide a single access to Rainbow Glen Road, which would reduce conflicts between landfill traffic and motorized and non-motorized traffic along Rainbow Glen Road.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide a single access to Gopher Canyon Road, which would reduce conflicts between landfill traffic and motorized and non-motorized traffic along Gopher Canyon Road.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide a single access to Lawrence Welk Drive, which would reduce conflicts between landfill traffic and motorized and non-motorized traffic along Lawrence Welk Drive.	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill would be located at the terminus of an extension of Siempre Viva Road and would not cause conflicts with through or other traffic at the entrance area.
Policy M-2.3 Environmentally Sensitive Road Design. Locate and design public and private roads to minimize impacts to significant biological and other environmental and visual resources. Avoid road alignments through floodplains to minimize impacts on floodplain habitats and limit the need for constructing flood control measures. Design new roads to maintain wildlife movement and retrofit existing roads for that purpose. Utilize fencing to reduce road kill and to direct animals to under crossings.	<b>Consistent.</b> The realignment of SR 76 and proposed access road would follow existing dirt roads and disturbed areas, and would not impact sensitive habitat. The alternative would require the development of a bridge across the San Luis Rey River. The scour/fluvial geomorphology analysis respective to the design of the bridge (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS) indicates that the bridge would not impede the floodway. The construction of the bridge would affect riparian habitat and potential nesting areas for least's Bell Vireo. These impacts would be reduced to less than significance through the implementation of mitigation set forth in the MMRP and presented in the EIS as design features of the alternative. However, the bridge and access road would not limit the wildlife movement, which would occur through the majority of the site which would remain as undeveloped open space.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would require the construction of approximately 2.25 miles of new roadway through existing natural open space. The roadway would be designed to reduce impacts to biological and visual resources by maintaining natural vegetation and outcrops to the extent feasible. A revegetation program would also be initiated along the roadway to replace damaged habitat.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would require the construction of approximately 0.5 mile of new roadway through existing natural open space along the Valley Vista Country Club Golf Course. The roadway would be designed to reduce impacts to biological and visual resources by maintaining natural vegetation and outcrops to the extent feasible. A revegetation program would also be initiated along the roadway to replace damaged habitat.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would require the construction of approximately 0.5 mile of new roadway through existing natural open space. The roadway would be designed to reduce impacts to biological and visual resources by maintaining natural vegetation and outcrops to the extent feasible. A revegetation program would also be initiated along the roadway to replace damaged habitat.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would require the construction of approximately 1.5 mile of new roadway through existing open space. The roadway would be designed to reduce impacts to biological and visual resources by maintaining natural vegetation and outcrops to the extent feasible. A revegetation program would also be initiated along the roadway to replace damaged habitat.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy M-2.4 Roadway Noise Buffers. Incorporate buffers or other noise reduction measures consistent with standards established in the Noise Element into the siting and design of roads located next to sensitive noise-receptors to minimize adverse impacts from traffic noise. Consider reduction measures such as alternative road design, reduced speeds, alternative paving, and setbacks or buffers, prior to berms and walls.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The section of SR 76 that would be realigned is not located adjacent to sensitive noise receptors, such as residential uses (See Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS). Because truck traffic on this roadway segment would not affect sensitive receptors, the siting and design of this segment would not incorporate buffers or other noise reduction measure. New access roads within the site would be not adjacent to sensitive receptors.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The Aspen Road Alternative would contribute to the noise levels along the new access road that would serve the site. No barriers along the new access roadway are anticipated. The new access road, however, would not be in close proximity to residential uses.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The alternative would contribute to the noise levels at residential uses in the proximity of the new access road that would serve the site. No barriers along the new access road are anticipated and there are no other feasible mitigation measures to reduce traffic noise.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would contribute to the noise levels along the new access road that would serve the site. No barriers along the new access roadway are anticipated. The access road, however, would not be in close proximity to residential uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would contribute to the noise levels along the new access road that would serve the site. No barriers along the new access roadway are anticipated. The access road, however, would not be in close proximity to residential uses.
Policy M-2.5 Minimize Excess Water Runoff. Require road improvements to be designed and constructed to accommodate stormwater in a manner that minimizes demands upon engineered stormwater systems and to maximize the use of natural detention and filtration techniques to mitigate environmental impacts.	<b>Consistent.</b> The realignment of SR 76 would be engineered to allow surface runoff as under existing conditions. This includes surface flow to permeable materials along the roadway and percolation into the natural soils. Surface runoff from onsite access roads, as with all areas of this site, would be collected through an extensive stormwater control system using natural detention and filtration (including water sedimentation basins, perimeter channels drainage swales, and filtration areas).	<b>Consistent.</b> All roadwork performed to access the property would be engineered to allow surface runoff. This includes surface flow to permeable materials along the roadway and percolation into the natural soils. Surface runoff from onsite access roads, as with all areas of this site, would be collected through an extensive stormwater control system using natural detention and filtration (including water sedimentation basins, perimeter channels drainage swales, and filtration areas).	<b>Consistent.</b> All roadwork performed to access the property would be engineered to allow surface runoff. This includes surface flow to permeable materials along the roadway and percolation into the natural soils. Surface runoff from onsite access roads, as with all areas of this site, would be collected through an extensive stormwater control system using natural detention and filtration (including water sedimentation basins, perimeter channels drainage swales, and filtration areas).	<b>Consistent.</b> All roadwork performed to access the property would be engineered to allow surface runoff. This includes surface flow to permeable materials along the roadway and percolation into the natural soils. Surface runoff from onsite access roads, as with all areas of this site, would be collected through an extensive stormwater control system using natural detention and filtration (including water sedimentation basins, perimeter channels drainage swales, and filtration areas).	<b>Consistent.</b> All roadwork performed to access the property would be engineered to allow surface runoff. This includes surface flow to permeable materials along the roadway and percolation into the natural soils. Surface runoff from onsite access roads, as with all areas of this site, would be collected through an extensive stormwater control system using natural detention and filtration (including water sedimentation basins, perimeter channels drainage swales, and filtration areas).
GOAL M-3 Transportation Facility Development. New or expanded transportation facilities that are phased with and equitably funded by the development that necessitates their construction.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative includes dedication of approximately 1,700 linear feet along SR 76 at the access road to realign and allow an eastbound deceleration lane and a westbound left turn lane. In addition to access improvements, a TIF will be paid by the applicant.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would fund the new access roadway and off-site roadway improvements.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would fund the new access roadway and off-site roadway improvements.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would fund the new access roadway and off-site roadway improvements.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would fund the new access roadway and off-site roadway improvements.
Policy M-3.1 Public Road Rights-of-Way. Require development to dedicate right-of-way for public roads and other transportation routes identified in the Mobility Element roadway network (see Mobility Element Network Appendix), Community Plans, or Road Master Plans. Require the provision of sufficient right-of-way width, as specified in the County Public Road Standards and Community Trails Master Plan, to adequately accommodate all users, including transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would include the improvement of approximately 1,700 linear feet along SR 76 at the access road to realign and widen the highway from 52 to 64 feet to provide for an eastbound deceleration lane and a westbound left turn lane. This would also allow for a bike lane, which is shown in the Mobility Plan for his area of SR 76.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would fund all right-of-way improvements to maintain acceptable service levels on the surrounding street and highway network.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would fund all right-of-way improvements to maintain acceptable service levels on the surrounding street and highway network.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would fund all right-of-way improvements to maintain acceptable service levels on the surrounding street and highway network.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would fund all right-of-way improvements to maintain acceptable service levels on the surrounding street and highway network.

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
Policy M-3.2 Traffic Impact Mitigation. Require development to contribute its fair share toward financing transportation facilities, including mitigating the associated direct and cumulative traffic impacts caused by their alternative on both the local and regional road networks. Transportation facilities include road networks and related transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and equestrian.	<b>Consistent.</b> A traffic study has been completed and is provided in Appendix M and is summarized in Section 4.15, Transportation, of the EIS. The alternative which would directly impact SR 76 (without proposed roadway improvements) and cumulatively impact SR 76. Impacts would be mitigation through a TIF and roadway improvements.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would fund all improvements to maintain acceptable service levels on the surrounding street and highway network.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would fund all right-of-way improvements to maintain acceptable service levels on the surrounding street and highway network.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would fund all right-of-way improvements to maintain acceptable service levels on the surrounding street and highway network.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would fund all right-of-way improvements to maintain acceptable service levels on the surrounding street and highway network.
Policy M-3.3 Multiple Ingress and Egress. Require development to provide multiple ingress/egress routes in conformance with State law and local regulations.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide a primary access road directly on SR 76, which would accommodate two-way traffic, and emergency access in accordance with state law and local regulations.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide a primary access road, which would accommodate two-way traffic, and emergency access, in accordance with state law and local regulations.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide a primary access road, which would accommodate two-way traffic, and emergency access, in accordance with state law and local regulations.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide a primary access road, which would accommodate two-way traffic, and emergency access, in accordance with state law and local regulations.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide a primary access road, which would accommodate two-way traffic, and emergency access, in accordance with state law and local regulations.
GOAL M-4, Roads designed to be safe for all users and compatible with their context, and Policies M-4.1 through M-4.6 apply to the County's provision of workable village roads, interconnected local roads, design and construction of public roads to meet travel demands in semi-rural and rural lands that are consistent with rural character , accommodation of emergency vehicles, design and construction of public and private roads to allow for necessary access for appropriately-sized fire apparatus, design and construct roads that are compatible with the local terrain and the uses, scale and pattern of the surrounding development, and inter jurisdictional coordination within spheres of Influence (SOIs) or that cross jurisdictional boundaries.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and regard County's street design standards (highway widths, medians, etc.), as reflected in the updated Mobility Plan Maintaining SR 76 at two lanes under the updated Mobility Plan reflects the intent of the County to maintain the existing rural character of this highway. However, uses in this alternative area served by SR 76 are also industrial in character (i.e., Rosemary's Mountain Quarry). The alternative would not change the standards set forth in the Mobility Plan.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and regard County's street design standards. The alternative would comply with all regulatory standards regarding highway widths, medians, and measures required to maintain rural character.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and regard County's street design standards. The alternative would comply with all regulatory standards regarding highway widths, medians, and measures required to maintain rural character.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and regard County's street design standards. The alternative would comply with all regulatory standards regarding highway widths, medians, and measures required to maintain rural character.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and regard County's street design standards. The alternative would comply with all regulatory standards regarding highway widths, medians, and measures required to maintain rural character.



TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
Policy M-11.8 Coordination with the County Trails Program. Coordinate the proposed bicycle and pedestrian network and facilities with the Community Trails Master Plan's proposed trails and pathways.	<b>Consistent.</b> The County's Bicycle Transportation Plan indicates a bike lane along SR 76 in the proximity of the site. The realignment and widening of SR 76 to allow passing lanes and to accommodate solid waste truck traffic would also improve the accommodation and safety of a bike lane along this site. The Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) indicates potential future trails crossing the property. These include the Fallbrook San Luis Rey River Trail (priority one), the Fallbrook Pala Road Pathway (priority three), and the Pala-Pauma SR 76 Pathway (priority three). The general alignments for the trails are located adjacent to the San Luis Rey River and SR 76, respectively. Development of the alternative would not preclude the opportunity to implement a trail along the San Luis Rey River and/or SR 76, if the County obtained funding and decided to develop such a trail at some time in the future. The landfill prism and ancillary facilities would be located to the south of such a trail routing.	The Community Trails Master Plan (CTMP) proposes the intersection of several trails on the site. A mitigation measure, which requires the Applicant to coordinate with the County of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation in order to identify a relocation off-site of the Fallbrook Red Mountain Trail, the Fallbrook Red Mountain Tierra Nuevo Trail, the Fallbrook Red Mountain Aspen Drive Trail, and the Fallbrook Red Mountain Reservoir Trail to provide appropriate trail connections and continuity of future trails in the CTMP, would bring the alternative into compliance with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Gopher Canyon Road site is not located on or adjacent to existing or proposed bicycle or pedestrian trail. Therefore, no trails would be affected by the alternative.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Merriam Mountain site is not located on or adjacent to existing or proposed bicycle or pedestrian trail. Therefore, no trails would be affected by the alternative.	<b>Consistent.</b> A trail from the Otay Valley Regional Park (located to the northwest of the East Otay Mesa site) extends toward the site. However, the access road and landfill would not adversely affect the proposed trail route.
CHAPTER 5 CONSERVATION AND MOBILITY ELEMENT					
GOAL COS-1, to provide regionally managed, inter-connected preserve system that embodies the regional biological diversity of San Diego County, and Policies COS-1.1 through COS-1-11 apply to an interconnected system of preserves. These include a regionally managed, interconnected preserve system that represents the regional biological diversity of San Diego County. Policies are to identify and develop the system; to prohibit development within a preserve; to monitor and manage the system, to collaborate with other jurisdictions to achieve common goals; to identify funding mechanisms; to support a proactive system of preserves; to prohibit opportunities for invasive species; to provide a transparent and inclusive decision-making process, and to monitor volunteers.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Although the alternative would provide a minimum of 1,313 acres of permanent open space, it is not located within an area designated as a preserve.	<b>Not Applicable. Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within an existing preserve.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within an existing preserve.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within an existing preserve.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within an existing preserve.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
GOAL COS-2 Sustainability of the Natural Environment. Sustainable ecosystems with long-term viability to maintain natural processes, sensitive lands, and sensitive as well as common species, coupled with sustainable growth and development.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide a minimum of 1,313 acres (approximately 75 percent of the site) of permanent open space for long-term preservation and enhancement of sensitive habitat and species. In addition, this alternative includes the implementation of a HRRMP for on-site biotic resources. The proposed post-closure end use for the Gregory Canyon property would be undeveloped open space.	<b>Consistent.</b> With the location of the landfill in the central portion of the property, the majority of the site would be cleared for landfill operations. The alternative will provide for the replanting of native species which would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. However, it is likely that no large open space areas would be provided within the site. The proposed post-closure end use for the Aspen Road property would be undeveloped open space.	<b>Consistent.</b> With the location of the landfill in the central portion of the property, the majority of the site would be cleared for landfill operations. The alternative will provide for the replanting of native species which would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. However, it is likely that no large open space areas would be provided within the site. The proposed post-closure end use for the Gopher Canyon Road property would be undeveloped open space.	<b>Consistent.</b> With the location of the landfill in the central portion of the property, the majority of the site would be cleared for landfill operations. The alternative will provide for the replanting of native species which would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. However, it is likely that no large open space areas would be provided within the site. The proposed post-closure end use for the Merriam Mountain property would be undeveloped open space.	<b>Consistent.</b> Because of the size of the site (450 acres), it is likely that some open space would be maintained within the site. The alternative would provide for the replanting of native species which would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. The proposed post-closure end use for the East Otay Mesa property would be undeveloped open space.
Policy COS-2.1 Protection, Restoration and Enhancement. Protect and enhance natural wildlife habitat outside of preserves as development occurs according to the underlying land use designation. Limit the degradation of regionally important natural habitats within the Semi-Rural and Rural Land regional categories, as well as within Village lands where appropriate.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be developed consistent with the underlying land use designation (Public/Semi-Public Lands (Solid Waste Facility) and, as described under GOAL COS-1, above, the alternative would provide for the preservation and restoration of sensitive habitat and species on approximately 75 percent (1,313 acres) of the site.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The landfill would be located in the canyon in the central section of the property, in an area containing native trees and other sensitive biotic resources. Because the property is designated as Rural and Semi-Rural Land, the alternative would not be consistent with this policy.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The landfill would be located in the canyon in the central section of the property, in an area containing native trees and other sensitive biotic resources. Because this portion of the property is designated as Rural and Semi-Rural Land, the alternative would not be consistent with this policy.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The landfill would be located in the canyon in the central section of the property, in an area containing native trees and other sensitive biotic resources. Because the property is designated as Rural Land, the alternative would not be consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be developed consistent with the underlying land use designation (Public/Semi-Public Lands (Solid Waste Facility) and, as described under GOAL COS-1,
Policy COS-2.2 Habitat Protection through Site Design. Require development to be sited in the least biologically sensitive areas and minimize the loss of natural habitat through site design.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would affect coastal sage scrub, coastal sage scrub/chaparral, coast live oak woodland, native perennial grassland, southern willow scrub, mule fat scrub, and Engelmann oak trees. With the implementation of a HRRMP and the set aside of a minimum of 1,313 acres of open space and use of the entire property as open space at the closure of the landfill, the alternative would minimize loss of natural habitat through site design (see Section 4.4, Biological Resources, of the EIS for an analysis of impacts to biological resources as well as design features and mitigation measures). However, with the location of the landfill within a canyon, impacts to species would not be avoided altogether.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would affect coastal sage scrub, coastal sage scrub/chaparral, and other native species. Mitigation measures requiring replanting with native species would reduce impacts to a less than adverse level; thereby complying with the intent of this policy to protect habitat through design. However, with the location of the landfill within a canyon, impacts to species would not be avoided altogether.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would affect coastal sage scrub, coastal sage scrub/chaparral, and other native species. Mitigation measures requiring replanting with native species would reduce impacts to a less than adverse level; thereby complying with the intent of this policy to protect habitat through design. However, with the location of the landfill within a canyon, impacts to species would not be avoided altogether.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would affect coastal sage scrub, coastal sage scrub/chaparral, and other native species. Mitigation measures requiring replanting with native species would reduce impacts to a less than adverse level; thereby complying with the intent of this policy to protect habitat through design. However, with the location of the landfill within a canyon, impacts to species would not be avoided altogether.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The site contains a mima mound-vernal pool complex that would be affected by the development of the landfill. No known off-site mitigation banks or other opportunities such as conservation are known for these resources. In addition, the re-creation of vernal pools can be challenging due to the specific soil and hydrology requirements. If on-site mitigation is determined feasible, mitigation would be required at a 2:1 ratio totaling 13.2 acres pursuant to the South County Plan. However, if on-site mitigation is determined infeasible, new off-site mitigation would be required.

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
GOAL COS-3 Protection and Enhancement of Wetlands. Wetlands that are restored and enhanced and protected from adverse impacts.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would potentially affect non-wetland waters of the U.S. and of riparian habitat within the San Luis River. With the implementation of design features, including the implementation of a HRRMP to restore habitat in the San Luis Rey River watershed, Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP), and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), the alternative would be consistent with this goal to protect wetlands from adverse impacts. The SWMP and SWPPP indicate the use of construction-related and permanent stormwater drainage control features, including sedimentation basins, perimeter channels, drainage swales, structural media filtration, and filtration areas. The SWMP also includes drainage control features selected to mimic the existing canyon flows and volumes tributary to the San Luis Rey River to provide both water quality treatment benefits and to minimize the potential for hydromodification impacts (See Sections 4.4, Biological Resources, 4.9, Hydrology, and 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Based on observations from the site boundaries, the Aspen Road Alternative supports potential wetlands within the Rainbow Creek tributary in the southeast portion of the site. The southern desilting basin and ancillary facilities would be located in the proximity of the tributary and Rainbow Creek. Water quality control measures, including compliance with applicable regulations would protect these resources from adverse impacts. Incorporated design features include the implementation of a SUSMP to protect wetlands and the minimum required five-foot separation between groundwater and waste, installation of a composite liner in compliance with the design standards for Class III solid waste sites as specified in 40 CFR, 258.40 and subdrain system below the liner and a leachate collection and removal system (LCRS) over the synthetic liner. A 60-foot high engineered fill berm would be located at the lower end of the landfill prism to increase stability and to reduce earthwork activities in the wetlands area.	<b>Consistent.</b> Based on the aerial analysis of the site, the Gopher Canyon Road Alternative would impact 1.1 acres (12,448 linear feet) of three tributaries to Gopher Creek, a jurisdictional non-wetland waters of the U.S. Water quality control measures, including compliance with applicable regulations would protect off-site resources from adverse impacts. Incorporated design features include the implementation of a SUSMP to protect wetlands and the minimum required five-foot separation between groundwater and waste, installation of a composite liner in compliance with the design standards for Class III solid waste sites as specified in 40 CFR, 258.40 and subdrain system below the liner and a leachate collection and removal system (LCRS) over the synthetic liner.	<b>Consistent.</b> 1Based on an aerial analysis of the site, the Merriam Mountain Alternative contains 1.2 acres (16,185 linear feet) of jurisdictional non-wetland waters of the U.S. within the Moosa Canyon tributary. Water quality control measures, including compliance with applicable regulations would protect the on-site resource from adverse impacts. Incorporated design features include the implementation of SWPPP to protect wetlands and the minimum required five-foot separation between groundwater and waste, installation of a composite liner in compliance with the design standards for Class III solid waste sites as specified in 40 CFR, 258.40 and subdrain system below the liner and a leachate collection and removal system (LCRS) over the synthetic liner.	<b>Consistent.</b> Based on observations from the site boundaries and aerial imagery, the East Otay Mesa Alternative would impact 0.59 acre (9,696 linear feet) of two jurisdictional non-wetland waters of the U.S. Water quality control measures, including compliance with applicable regulations would protect the on-site resource from adverse impacts. Incorporated design features include the implementation of a SUSMP to protect wetlands and the minimum required five-foot separation between groundwater and waste, installation of a composite liner in compliance with the design standards for Class III solid waste sites as specified in 40 CFR, 258.40 and subdrain system below the liner and a leachate collection and removal system (LCRS) over the synthetic liner.
Policy COS-3.1 Wetland Protection. Require development to preserve existing natural wetland areas and associated transitional riparian and upland buffers and retain opportunities for enhancement.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The alternative would be required to mitigate all impacts to habitat in accordance with USFWS requirements. The alternative would include a minimum 100-foot riparian buffer between the landfill operations and the river habitat, except where the access road/bridge crosses the river, litter control and removal and the implementation of a HRRMP to establish habitat in the San Luis Rey River watershed on site. The alternative would also provide a minimum of 1,313 acres of permanent open space for the enhancement and preservation of sensitive species.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be required to mitigate all impacts to habitat in the vicinity of the blue line stream and Rainbow Creek in accordance with USFWS requirements (see Section, 4.4, Biological Resources of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative is not in the proximity of wetlands and would not affect riparian habitat.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be required to mitigate all impacts to habitat in the vicinity of the blue line stream in accordance with USFWS requirements (see Section, 4.4, Biological Resources of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be required to mitigate all impacts to habitat in the vicinity of the blue line stream in accordance with USFWS requirements (see Section, 4.4, Biological Resources of the EIS).

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy COS-3.2 Minimize Impacts of Development. Require development projects to:  Mitigate any unavoidable losses of wetlands, including its habitat functions and values; and  Protect wetlands, including vernal pools, from a variety of discharges and activities, such as dredging or adding fill material, exposure to pollutants such as nutrients, hydro-modification, land and vegetation clearing, and the introduction of invasive species.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be required to mitigate all impacts to riparian habitat in accordance with USFWS and USACE requirements. As indicated above, the alternative would implement an HRRMP, which HRRMP focuses on the establishment of on-site riparian and upland habitats within the San Luis Rey River floodplain. The HRRMP includes restoration or lost or damaged habitat; removal of highly invasive, exotic plant species; and excavation of berms to restore more historic river flows and to bring the ground elevations to a level that would connect the river to the groundwater system(see Sections 4.4, Biological Resources and 4.14 Surface Hydrology, of the EIS for more detailed discussions).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be required to mitigate all impacts to riparian habitat in accordance with USFWS and USACE requirements (see Section, 4.4, Biological Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent</b> The alternative would be required to mitigate all impacts to riparian habitat in accordance with USFWS and USACE requirements (see Section, 4.4, Biological Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be required to mitigate all impacts to habitat in accordance with USFWS and USACE requirements (see Section, 4.4, Biological Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be required to mitigate all impacts to habitat in accordance with USFWS and USACE requirements (see Section, 4.4, Biological Resources, of the EIS).
GOAL COS-4 Water Management. A balanced and regionally integrated water management approach to achieve the long-term viability of the County's water quality and supply.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would result in an increase in water use compared to the current water use (the site is currently vacant), the increase would occur only during the times when periodic construction occurs simultaneously with the acceptance of waste. The majority of the time, demand would be less water than the current estimated water use on the site. The alternative would not encourage activities that use large amounts of water in a wasteful manner and sufficient water capacity exists in the basin for the alternative. Design features would protect surface and groundwater from future contamination (see Sections 4.16.1, Water Supply, and 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Water demand during construction and operation would be similar to the Applicant's Proposed Alternative and would be less than water demand associated with the buildout of the General Plan zoning designation of the property (residential and agricultural uses) of the property. The alternative would result in an increase in water use compared to the current water use (the site is currently vacant), and high demand would occur only during the times when periodic construction occurs simultaneously with the acceptance of waste. Design features would protect surface and groundwater from future contamination (see Sections 4.16.1, Water Supply, and 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Water demand during construction and operation would be similar to the Applicant's Proposed Alternative and would be less than water demand associated with the buildout of the General Plan zoning designation of the property (residential and agricultural uses) of the property. The alternative would result in an increase in water use compared to the current water use (the site is currently vacant), high demand would occur only during the times when periodic construction occurs simultaneously with the acceptance of waste. The alternative would not encourage activities that use large amounts of water in a wasteful manner. Design features would protect surface and groundwater from future contamination (see Sections 4.16.1, Water Supply, and 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Water demand during construction and operation would be similar to the Applicant's Proposed Alternative and would be less than water demand associated with the buildout of the General Plan zoning designation of the property (residential and agricultural uses) of the property. The alternative would result in an increase in water use compared to the current water use (the site is currently vacant), and high demand would occur only during the times when periodic construction occurs simultaneously with the acceptance of waste. The alternative would not encourage activities that use large amounts of water in a wasteful manner. Design features would protect surface and groundwater from future contamination (see Sections 4.16.1, Water Supply, and 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Water demand during construction and operation would be similar to the Applicant's Proposed Alternative and would be less than water demand associated with the buildout of the General Plan zoning designation of the property (residential and agricultural uses) of the property. The alternative would result in an increase in water use compared to the current water use (the site is currently vacant), and high demand would occur only during the times when periodic construction occurs simultaneously with the acceptance of waste. The alternative would not encourage activities that use large amounts of water in a wasteful manner. Design features would protect surface and groundwater from future contamination (see Sections 4.16.1, Water Supply, and 4.9, Hydrogeology, of the EIS).

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy COS-4.1 Water Conservation. Require development to reduce the waste of potable water through use of efficient technologies and conservation efforts that minimize the County's dependence on imported water and conserve groundwater resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> Water conservation measures, including not using water in a wasteful manner and the use of soil sealants on unpaved internal access roadways and drought-tolerant landscaping. Monitoring of on-site wells would be implemented to ensure safe yield and protection of groundwater resources, and the use of imported, pre-moisturized material for the clay liner would reduce the on-site water demand.	<b>Consistent.</b> Water conservation measures, including not using water in a wasteful manner and the use of soil sealants and the use of soil sealants on unpaved internal access roadways and drought-tolerant landscaping. Water demand at the site would likely be accommodated by municipal water suppliers, either FPUD or RMWD. A maximum water demand of 75 AFY is anticipated. This represents a small increase in total anticipated water demand and, as concluded in the UWMPs for these water providers, water supplies would meet or exceed the projected water demand within the districts, although both suppliers may need to implement conservation measures in the case of multiple dry years.	<b>Consistent.</b> Water conservation measures, including not using water in a wasteful manner and the use of soil sealants on unpaved internal access roadways and drought-tolerant landscaping. . It is assumed that the Gopher Canyon Alternative would rely on groundwater for the initial construction, operation, and closure of the landfill with the potential for supplemental supplies to be provided through a contract with SGVWC. On-site improvements to use groundwater at the site would include the installation of groundwater wells and associated piping, and storage tanks.	<b>Consistent.</b> Water conservation measures, including not using water in a wasteful manner and the use of soil sealants on unpaved internal access roadways and drought-tolerant landscaping. It is assumed that the Gopher Canyon Alternative would rely on groundwater for the initial construction, operation, and closure of the landfill with the potential for supplemental supplies to be provided through a contract with SGVWC.	<b>Consistent.</b> Water conservation measures, including not using water in a wasteful manner and the use of soil sealants on unpaved internal access roadways and drought-tolerant landscaping. Water demand at the site would likely be accommodated by the Otay Water District.
Policy COS-4.2 Drought-Efficient Landscaping. Require efficient irrigation systems and in new development encourage the use of native species and non-invasive drought tolerant/low water use plants in landscaping.	<b>Consistent.</b> Native species and non-invasive drought tolerant/low water use plants would be used on the site. Irrigation would be required for small areas of permanent landscaping at the landfill entrance and around the administration facilities, as well as within the proposed wetland and oak tree restoration/enhancement sites. All other landscaped areas would be planted with non-irrigated, drought tolerant native vegetation, which would be watered at planting and during the initial establishment period.	<b>Consistent.</b> Native species and non-invasive drought tolerant/low water use plants would be used on the site. Irrigation would be required for small areas of permanent landscaping at the landfill entrance and around the administration facilities. All other landscaped areas would be planted with non-irrigated, drought tolerant native vegetation, which would be watered at planting and during the initial establishment period.	<b>Consistent.</b> Native species and non-invasive drought tolerant/low water use plants would be used on the site. Irrigation would be required for small areas of permanent landscaping at the landfill entrance and around the administration facilities. All other landscaped areas would be planted with non-irrigated, drought tolerant native vegetation, which would be watered at planting and during the initial establishment period.	<b>Consistent.</b> Native species and non-invasive drought tolerant/low water use plants would be used on the site. Irrigation would be required for small areas of permanent landscaping at the landfill entrance and around the administration facilities. All other landscaped areas would be planted with non-irrigated, drought tolerant native vegetation, which would be watered at planting and during the initial establishment period.	<b>Consistent.</b> Native species and non-invasive drought tolerant/low water use plants would be used on the site. Irrigation would be required for small areas of permanent landscaping at the landfill entrance and around the administration facilities. All other landscaped areas would be planted with non-irrigated, drought tolerant native vegetation, which would be watered at planting and during the initial establishment period.
Policy COS-4.3 Stormwater Filtration. Maximize stormwater filtration and/or filtration in areas that are not subject to high groundwater by maximizing the natural drainage patterns and the retention of natural vegetation and other pervious surfaces. This policy shall not apply in areas with high groundwater, where raising the water table could cause septic system failures, moisture damage to building slabs, and/or other problems.	<b>Consistent.</b> The SWPPP prepared for the alternative would provide storm filtration techniques for construction and operation, including sedimentation (desilting) basins, structural media filtration, perimeter channels, and swales. The SWMP includes drainage control features to provide both water quality treatment benefits and to minimize the potential for hydro-modification impacts.	<b>Consistent.</b> The SWPPP prepared for the alternative would provide storm filtration techniques for construction and operation, including sedimentation (desilting) basins, structural media filtration, perimeter channels, and swales. The SWMP includes drainage control features to provide both water quality benefits and to minimize the potential for hydro-modification impacts.	The SWPPP prepared for the alternative would provide storm filtration techniques for construction and operation, including sedimentation (desilting) basins, structural media filtration, perimeter channels, and swales. The SWMP includes drainage control features to provide water quality benefits and to minimize the potential for erosion.	The SWPPP prepared for the alternative would provide storm filtration techniques for construction and operation, including sedimentation (desilting) basins, structural media filtration, perimeter channels, and swales. The SWMP includes drainage control features to provide water quality benefits and to minimize the potential for erosion.	The SWPPP prepared for the alternative would provide storm filtration techniques for construction and operation, including sedimentation (desilting) basins, structural media filtration, perimeter channels, and swales. The SWMP would include drainage control features to provide both water quality benefits and to minimize the potential for erosion.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy COS-4.4 Groundwater Contamination. Require land uses with a high potential to contaminate groundwater to take appropriate measures to protect water supply sources.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a range of techniques and processes to prevent contaminants from entering the groundwater supply. The alternative would use a The liner system includes a subdrain system, double composite liner system, and leachate and collection removal system (LCRS). A liner system would be placed over the entire excavated subgrade (i.e., bottom and side slopes). Details regarding additional groundwater protection systems are provided in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, in the EIS.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a range of techniques and processes to prevent contaminants from entering the groundwater supply, including a liner and leachate collection system. Details regarding additional groundwater protection systems are provided in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, in the EIS.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a range of techniques and processes to prevent contaminants from entering the groundwater supply. Details regarding additional groundwater protection systems are provided in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, in the EIS.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a range of techniques and processes to prevent contaminants from entering the groundwater supply. Details regarding additional groundwater protection systems are provided in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, in the EIS.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a range of techniques and processes to prevent contaminants from entering the groundwater supply. Details regarding additional groundwater protection systems are provided in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, in the EIS.
Policy COS-4.5 Recycled Water. Promote the use of recycled water and gray water systems where feasible.	<b>Consistent.</b> Currently, no reclaimed water facilities exist to serve this site. The primary water supply would be from onsite well water, which the property has historically used by right. Water use would be monitored and if safe yield could not be met, recycled water would be purchased and imported in accordance with a current contract agreement with a supplier.	<b>Consistent.</b> Currently, no reclaimed water facilities exist to serve this site. The primary water supply would be from municipal sources, and if recycled water supplies become available recycled water could be used during construction and operation. As with the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, recycled water could be purchased and imported by a supplier.	<b>Consistent.</b> Currently, no reclaimed water facilities exist to serve this site. The primary water supply would be from municipal sources, and if recycled water supplies become available recycled water could be used during construction and operation. As with the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, recycled water could be purchased and imported by a supplier.	<b>Consistent.</b> Currently, no reclaimed water facilities exist to serve this site. The primary water supply would be from municipal sources, and if recycled water supplies become available recycled water could be used during construction and operation. As with the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, recycled water could be purchased and imported by a supplier.	<b>Consistent.</b> Currently, no reclaimed water facilities exist to serve this site. The primary water supply would be from municipal sources, and if recycled water supplies become available recycled water could be used during construction and operation. As with the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, recycled water could be purchased and imported by a supplier.
GOAL COS-5 Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources. Protection and maintenance of local reservoirs, watersheds, aquifer-recharge areas, and natural drainage systems to maintain high-quality water resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a SWPPP to ensure the protection of water resources and watersheds. The SWPPP would define the alternative's construction-related and permanent stormwater drainage control features, which would include sedimentation basins, perimeter channels, drainage swales, structural media filtration, and filtration areas.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a SWPPP to ensure the protection of water resources and watersheds. The SWPPP would define the alternative's construction-related and permanent stormwater drainage control features, which would include sedimentation basins, perimeter channels, drainage swales, structural media filtration, and filtration areas.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a SWPPP to ensure the protection of water resources and watersheds. The SWPPP would define the alternative's construction-related and permanent stormwater drainage control features, which would include sedimentation basins, perimeter channels, drainage swales, structural media filtration, and filtration areas.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a SWPPP to ensure the protection of water resources and watersheds. The SWPPP would define the alternative's construction-related and permanent stormwater drainage control features, which would include sedimentation basins, perimeter channels, drainage swales, structural media filtration, and filtration areas.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a SWPPP to ensure the protection of water resources and watersheds. The SWPPP would define the alternative's construction-related and permanent stormwater drainage control features, which would include sedimentation basins, perimeter channels, drainage swales, structural media filtration, and filtration areas.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy COS-5.1 Impact to Floodways and Floodplains. Restrict development in floodways and floodplains in accordance with policies in the Flood Hazards section of the Safety Element.	<b>Consistent.</b> Portions of this site along the river are located in 100-year and 500-year floodplains, and the potential exists for the future bridge to be damaged by the scouring effect of flood waters. Bridge footings would be designed to safeguard against potential scour through the use of rip-rap or some other protective material and implementation of mitigation measures related to design of bridge piers (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, in the EIS). In addition, to avoid scour effects upstream and downstream of the bridge, channel modifications have been designed to maintain the existing channel velocities and flood elevations. Excavation in the river channel would maintain the 100-year flood elevations at or below existing levels. The landfill footprint and ancillary facilities are not located in the floodway or 100-year floodplain. Because the alternative would not adversely affect floodways and floodplains or be developed with occupied uses, it would be consistent with the intent of this policy.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a 100-year floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a 100-year floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a 100-year floodplain.
Policy COS-5.2 Impervious Surfaces. Require development to minimize the use of directly connected impervious surfaces and to retain stormwater run-off caused from the development footprint at or near the site of generation.	<b>Consistent.</b> As required by the SUSMP, which would be prepared for the alternative in accordance with state and federal water quality standards, all storm water would be retained and filtered before it leaves the site. The majority of the site would be pervious surfaces with intermittent impervious surfaces footprints and paved roadway. The landfill would be lined with an impervious clay liner and runoff would be collected in perimeter channels and directed to sedimentation basins prior to entering the groundwater or river.	<b>Consistent.</b> As required by the SWPPP that would be prepared for the alternative in accordance with state and federal water quality standards, all storm water would be retained and filtered before it leaves the site. The majority of the site would be pervious surfaces with intermittent impervious surfaces such as building and storage tank footprints and paved roadway. The landfill would be lined with an impervious clay liner and runoff would be collected in perimeter channels and directed to sedimentation basins prior to entering the groundwater.	<b>Consistent.</b> As required by the SWPPP prepared for the alternative in accordance with state and federal water quality standards, all storm water would be retained and filtered before it leaves the site. The majority of the site would be pervious surfaces with intermittent impervious surfaces such as building and storage tank footprints and paved roadway. The landfill would be lined with an impervious clay liner and runoff would be collected in perimeter channels and directed to sedimentation basins prior to entering the groundwater.	<b>Consistent.</b> As required by the SWPPP prepared for the alternative in accordance with state and federal water quality standards, all storm water would be retained and filtered before it leaves the site. The majority of the site would be pervious surfaces with intermittent impervious surfaces such as building and storage tank footprints and paved roadway. The landfill would be lined with an impervious clay liner and runoff would be collected in perimeter channels and directed to sedimentation basins prior to entering the groundwater.	<b>Consistent.</b> As required by the SWPPP prepared for the alternative in accordance with state and federal water quality standards, all stormwater would be retained and filtered before it leaves the site. The majority of the site would be pervious surfaces with intermittent impervious surfaces such as building and storage tank footprints and paved roadway. The landfill would be lined with an impervious clay liner and runoff would be collected in perimeter channels and directed to sedimentation basins prior to entering the groundwater.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy COS-5.3 Downslope Protection. Require development to be appropriately sited and to incorporate measures to retain natural flow regimes, thereby protecting downslope areas from erosion, capturing runoff to adequately allow for filtration and/or filtration, and protecting downstream biological resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> Surface water monitoring at the landfill would be conducted to monitor seasonal surface water run-off at designated monitoring points, including the top and bottom of the canyon (if water is present), and within the San Luis Rey River, up and downstream of the point where Gregory Canyon intersects the river, in accordance with RWQCB requirements. The alternative's SWPPP would provide BMP's to protect water quality during construction and over the life of the alternative, would minimize the transport of sediment off-site. The BMPs would focus on erosion prevention and sediment control measures. Desilting basins would be implemented as a secondary means of controlling sediment transport. Other measures such as downdrains to reduce runoff concentrations on unprotected areas of the waste prism, the use of energy dissipators to reduce the velocity of storm water discharge, erosion control such as erosion control mats, mulching and hydroseeding; sediment control BMPs and other measures would reduce	<b>Consistent.</b> All runoff from the site would be captured through measures set forth in the SWMP and SWPPP as under the Applicant's Proposed Alternative. Capturing runoff would prevent erosion, scouring, or other harm to downstream areas.	<b>Consistent.</b> All runoff from the site would be captured through measures set forth in the SWMP and SWPPP as under the Applicant's Proposed Alternative. Capturing runoff would prevent erosion and other harm to downstream areas and would protect downstream biological resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> All runoff from the site would be captured through measures set forth in the SWMP and SWPPP as under the Applicant's Proposed Alternative. Capturing runoff would prevent erosion, scouring, or other harm to downstream areas.	<b>Consistent.</b> All runoff from the site would be captured through measures set forth in the SWMP and SWPPP as under the Applicant's Proposed Alternative. Capturing runoff would prevent erosion, and other harm to downstream areas.
Policy COS-5.4 Invasive Species. Encourage the removal of invasive species to restore natural drainage systems, habitats, and natural hydrologic regimes of watercourses.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would control invasive, exotic plant species, including the river channel excavation area, through the HRRMP. Under this plan, man-made berms and weed seed banks in the river's watershed would be excavated to restore more historic river flows and invasive, non-native species would be replaced with native plantings. The excavation would be focused on bringing the ground elevations down to level that would connect the areas hydrologically with the existing groundwater system and to create a series of terraces that taper into the existing upland habitat. All upland and drier riparian areas would be planted with tree species native to the site and hand-seeded to initiate native plant re-establishment. Weed control and monitoring would be implemented regularly during the first five years of each phase of restoration to prevent the re-establishment of non-native species	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would control invasive, exotic plant species in graded areas through the mitigation measures that require replanting of native species (see Section 4.1, Aesthetics, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would control invasive, exotic plant species in graded areas through the mitigation measures that require replanting of native species (see Section 4.1, Aesthetics, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent</b> The alternative would control invasive, exotic plant species in graded areas through the mitigation measures that require replanting of native species (see Section 4.1, Aesthetics, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent</b> The alternative would control invasive, exotic plant species in graded areas through the mitigation measures that require replanting of native species (see Section 4.1, Aesthetics, of the EIS).



TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
	(see Section 4.4, Biological Resources, of the EIS).				
Policy COS-5.5 Impacts of Development to Water Quality. Require development projects to avoid impacts to the water quality in local reservoirs, groundwater resources, and recharge areas, watersheds, and other local water sources.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a double liner system, ground and surface water monitoring, and BMPs outlined in the SWPPP that would prevent impacts to water quality in local reservoirs, groundwater resources, recharge areas, and watersheds, while allowing for recharge of aquifers. (Please refer to Policy COS-5.3, above, and to Sections 4.9, Hydrogeology, and 4.14, Surface Hydrology, in the EIS.)	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a single composite liner system, ground and surface water monitoring, and BMPs outlined in a SWPPP that would prevent impacts to water quality in local reservoirs, groundwater resources, recharge areas, and watersheds, while allowing for recharge of aquifers.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a single composite liner system, ground and surface water monitoring, and BMPs outlined in a SWPPP that would prevent impacts to water quality in local reservoirs, groundwater resources, recharge areas, and watersheds, while allowing for recharge of aquifers.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a single composite liner system, ground and surface water monitoring, and BMPs outlined in a SWPPP that would prevent impacts to water quality in local reservoirs, groundwater resources, recharge areas, and watersheds, while allowing for recharge of aquifers.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a single composite liner system, ground and surface water monitoring, and BMPs outlined in a SWPPP that would prevent impacts to water quality in local reservoirs, groundwater resources, recharge areas, and watersheds, while allowing for recharge of aquifers.
GOAL COS-6 Sustainable Agricultural Industry. A viable and long-term agricultural industry and sustainable agricultural land uses in the County of San Diego that serve as a beneficial resource and contributor to the County's rural character and open space network.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is zoned Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility). The site is not designated for agricultural use.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The alternative would adversely impact an on-site area designated as an Agricultural Conservation area and, as such, would not be consistent with this policy to support sustainable agricultural land uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is zoned for rural uses that would allow agricultural land uses. However, the property has not been used for agricultural purposes and may not be suitable for agriculture. The alternative would not affect sustainable agriculture in the county.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is zoned for rural uses that would allow agricultural land uses. However, the property has not been used for agricultural purposes and may not be suitable for agriculture. The alternative would not affect sustainable agriculture in the county.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is zoned Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility). The site is not designated for agricultural use.
Policy COS-6.1 Economic Diversity. Support the economic competitiveness of agriculture and encourage the diversification of potential sources of farm income, including value added products, agricultural tourism, roadside stands, organic farming, and farmers markets.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would not impede or reduce the economic competitive strength of the County's agricultural industry. Although this site is located in proximity to an active agricultural area, it would not significantly impact water quality, groundwater supply, local air quality, or cause other environmental effects that would adversely affect existing agricultural uses, or the diversity of crops, in the surrounding area (see Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would not impede or reduce the economic competitive strength of the County's agricultural industry. Although this site is located in proximity to an active agricultural area, it would not significantly impact water quality, groundwater supply, local air quality, or cause other environmental effects that would adversely affect existing agricultural uses or the diversity of crops in the surrounding area.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would not impede or reduce the economic competitive strength of the County's agricultural industry. The alternative would not significantly impact water quality, groundwater supply, local air quality, or cause other environmental effects that would adversely affect existing agricultural uses or the diversity of crops in the surrounding area.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would not impede or reduce the economic competitive strength of the County's agricultural industry. The alternative would not significantly impact water quality, groundwater supply, local air quality, or cause other environmental effects that would adversely affect existing agricultural uses or the diversity of crops in the surrounding area.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would not impede or reduce the economic competitive strength of the County's agricultural industry. The alternative would not significantly impact water quality, groundwater supply, local air quality, or cause other environmental effects that would adversely affect existing agricultural uses or the diversity of crops in the Otay Mesa area.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
<p>Policy COS-6.2 Protection of Agricultural Operations. Protect existing agricultural operations from encroachment of incompatible land uses by doing the following:</p> <p>Limiting the ability of new development to take actions to limit existing agricultural uses by informing and educating new projects as to the potential impacts from agricultural operations</p> <p>Encouraging new or expanded agricultural land uses to provide a buffer of non-intensive agriculture or other appropriate uses (e.g., landscape screening) between intensive uses and adjacent non-agricultural land uses</p> <p>Allowing for agricultural uses in agricultural areas and designing development and lots in a manner that facilitates continued agricultural use within the development</p> <p>Requiring development to minimize potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations through the incorporation of adequate buffers, setbacks, and alternative design measures to protect surrounding agriculture</p> <p>Supporting local and State right-to-farm regulations</p> <p>Retain or facilitate large and contiguous agricultural operations by consolidation of development during the subdivision process</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be contained entirely within this site and would not encroach into surrounding agricultural lands. At its nearest point, the landfill footprint and the extent of operations would be approximately 3,300 feet from the nearest agricultural contract lands adjacent to this site's western property line. Borrow/Stockpile Area A would be within 100 feet of agricultural lands to the west. Borrow/Stockpile A would be used during initial construction and then revegetated and not used until about year 25. Offsite agricultural areas are protected from Borrow/Stockpile Area B by natural topography.</p> <p>Landfill effects, such as dust, would be controlled through design features and other potential impacts, such as microclimate changes due to landform alteration would not significantly affect avocado and citrus orchards and other crop areas surrounding the site (see Sections 4.2, Agricultural Resources, and 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the EIS). Because the alternative would not significantly impact agricultural resources, it would be consistent with the policy to protect agricultural operations.</p>	<p><b>Not Consistent.</b> A section of the property is an Agricultural Conservation tract and other portions of the site have been used for orchard operations. The Agricultural Conservation area and agricultural sites would be adversely affected by the landfill and potentially unusable for agricultural purposes. Therefore, this alternative would not be consistent with this policy to protect agricultural operations.</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is zoned for rural uses that would allow agricultural land uses. However, the property and immediately adjacent areas have not been used for agricultural purposes and may not be suitable for agriculture. The alternative would not adversely affect any agricultural operations.</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is zoned for rural uses that would allow agricultural land uses. However, the property and immediately adjacent areas have not been used for agricultural purposes and may not be suitable for agriculture. The alternative would not adversely affect any agricultural operations.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> Although a section of the site is designated under the FMMP as Farmland of Local Importance, the existing SWF zoning does not anticipate the continued use of the site for farming. The landfill would not adversely affect any surrounding agricultural operations.</p>
<p>Policy COS-6.3 Compatibility with Recreation and Open Space. Encourage siting recreational and open space uses and multi-use trails that are compatible with agriculture adjacent to the agricultural lands when planning for development adjacent to agricultural land uses.</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is currently not an agricultural site and, as such, this policy would not be applicable. However, the alternative would provide a minimum of 1,313 acres of open space at the initiation of landfill activities and, after the landfill closes, the entire site would be maintained as open space. The open space use would be compatible with adjacent agricultural uses. During the operation of the landfill, that area occupied by the landfill footprint and ancillary facilities would not be considered an open space use.</p>	<p><b>Not Consistent.</b> A portion of the property has been used for agricultural purposes (generally avocado farming) and a section is designated as an agricultural conservation area. Although the entire site would be maintained as open space upon closure, the alternative would not be compatible with designated on-site agricultural resources.</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not an agricultural site and, as such, this policy would not be applicable. The property would contain an open space component around the perimeter of the landfill prism, and the entire site would be maintained as open space upon closure. The proposed use would not be incompatible with off-site agricultural uses.</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not an agricultural site and, as such, this policy would not be applicable. The property would contain an open space component around the perimeter of the landfill prism, and the entire site would be maintained as open space upon closure. The proposed use would not be incompatible with off-site agricultural uses.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> A portion of the property was used for agricultural purposes in the past and a section is designated as Department of Conservation FMMP Farmland of Local Importance (based on former farming on the site and surrounding area). The proposed use would not be incompatible with any off-site agricultural uses.</p>

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
Policy COS-6.4 Conservation Easements. Support the acquisition or voluntary dedication of agriculture conservation easements and programs that preserve agricultural lands.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is zoned Public/Semi-Public Lands (Solid Waste Facility) and is not currently agricultural land or eligible for respective agricultural easement, or agricultural conservation status.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> A portion of the property is designated as an agricultural conservation area. Because this contract area would be adversely affected by the landfill, this alternative would not support conservation easements.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The Gopher Canyon Road property has not been used for agricultural purposes and is not eligible for respective agricultural easement or agricultural conservation status.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The Gopher Canyon Road property has not been used for agricultural purposes and is not eligible for respective agricultural easement or agricultural conservation status.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is zoned Public/Semi-Public Lands (Solid Waste Facility). No areas of the site comprise agricultural conservation easements. Therefore, the development of the site would not affect existing conservation easements. A portion of the site has been identified as Farmland of Local Importance. However, the use of the site as a landfill would not be incompatible with any off-site agricultural use.
GOAL COS-7 Protection and Preservation of Archaeological Resources. Protection and preservation of the County's important archeological resources for their cultural importance to local communities, as well as their research and educational potential.	<p><b>Consistent.</b> As described in the Cultural Resources technical analysis (see the Cultural Resources Technical Report, contained in Appendix H of the EIS) and summarized in Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS, the alternative would directly or indirectly impact onsite archaeological resources. Cultural resources would be protected to the extent feasible. Direct impacts could occur at the Higgins Family Cemetery (a historic resource) and unintentional disturbance (i.e., indirect effects) could occur at approximately seven significant/CR-eligible archaeological sites. In addition, previously unknown significant cultural sites could be exposed and potentially damaged during earth-moving activities. Design features and mitigation measures would reduce impacts on these resources to a less than significant level.</p> <p>The Cultural Resources analysis also evaluates potential impacts to ethnographic resources, including Gregory Mountain and Medicine Rock. Impacts to Native American resources by this alternative would be mitigated in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Although design features and mitigation measures could increase access to Gregory Mountain and preserve the upper slopes of the mountain in open space, the design features may not mitigate potential effects to a less than significant level. Impacts on traditional use sites (Gregory Mountain and Medicine Rock) are significant and,</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would potentially impact two archaeological resources and other potential resources including ethnobotanical plants, located within the development area. Mitigation measures, including replanting of native species, would be implemented to protect these cultural resources to the extent feasible.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would potentially impact any archaeological and cultural resources (which may include ethnobotanical plants), located within the development area. Mitigation measures, including replanting of native species, would be implemented to protect these cultural resources to the extent feasible.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would potentially impact any archaeological and cultural resources (which may include ethnobotanical plants), located within the development area. Mitigation measures, including replanting of native species, would be implemented to protect these cultural resources to the extent feasible.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would potentially impact any archaeological and cultural resources (which may include ethnobotanical plants), located within the development area. Mitigation measures, including replanting of native species, would be implemented to protect these cultural resources to the extent feasible.</p>

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
	based on their intangible use could remain after mitigation. Certain plants (ethnobotanical plants) important to the Native American community and the continuation of their traditional cultural practices could be impacted. However, the MMRP identifies measures that would retain Tribal access to these resources. Measures include the creation of in-kind habitats and incorporation of these habitats into the dedicated open space areas with the opportunity for Tribal input. Because impacts to archaeological resources would be mitigated to the extent feasible, the alternative would be consistent with this policy.				
Policy COS-7.1 Archaeological Protection. Preserve important archaeological resources from loss or destruction and require development to include appropriate mitigation to protect the quality and integrity of these resources.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> Impacts to archaeological resources would be protected to the extent feasible through the implementation of design features and all other feasible mitigation measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS). Impacts to on-site archaeological and historical resources would be reduced to a less than significant level through the implementation of measures; however, design features would not reduce impacts to offsite cultural resources, with respect to the cultural experience of Gregory Mountain and Medicine Rock to less than significant levels. Therefore, the alternative would be only partially consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> Impacts to archaeological resources would be protected to the extent feasible through the implementation of mitigation measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Impacts to archaeological resources would be protected to the extent feasible through the implementation of mitigation measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Impacts to archaeological resources would be protected to the extent feasible through the implementation of mitigation measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Impacts to archaeological resources would be protected to the extent feasible through the implementation of mitigation measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS).
COS-7.2 Open Space Easements. Require development to avoid archeological resources whenever possible. If complete avoidance is not possible, require development to fully mitigate impacts to archaeological resources.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> The design features of the alternative would reduce impacts to on-site archaeological and historical impacts to a less than significant level. However, this alternative would result in long-term physical alterations to Gregory Canyon which is at the base of the sacred Gregory Mountain cultural resource and, therefore, potentially disrupt any ongoing traditional Native American activities associated with this resource. To mitigate this impact, the applicant would dedicate the portion of the site east of the landfill footprint and relocated SDG&E easement including the	<b>Consistent.</b> Impacts to archaeological resources would be protected to the extent feasible through the implementation of mitigation measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Impacts to archaeological resources would be protected to the extent feasible through the implementation of mitigation measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Impacts to archaeological resources would be protected to the extent feasible through the implementation of mitigation measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Impacts to archaeological resources would be protected to the extent feasible through the implementation of mitigation measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS).

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
	<p>western slopes and the top of Gregory Mountain, as permanent open space or execute and convey a permanent open space easement over this area. The access easement would grant the Pala Band of Mission Indians the right to walk or hike only within the access easement area. If the Pala Band agree, the applicant would pay to the Pala Band of Mission Indians a fixed dollar amount to improve and maintain access to Gregory Mountain from the Pala Reservation during landfill operation. Such improvement measures may include, but are not limited to, a new footpath, clearing of a footpath that previously existed from the eastern base of Gregory Mountain to the top of the mountain, or the marking of new footpath trail as determined by Pala at its discretion. Measures also include postponing landfilling activities on the western slope of Gregory Mountain above the existing SDG&amp;E transmission line for as long as practically possible.</p> <p>However, impacts to Gregory Mountain and Medicine Rock could not be entirely avoided and, as such impacts could not be fully mitigated.</p>				
Policy COS-7.3 Archaeological Collections. Require the appropriate treatment and preservation of archaeological collections in a culturally appropriate manner.	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The design features require that artifacts would be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards and transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County. The proper storage and treatment of collections would be based on consultation with the affected community. Existing federal and state law governs the treatment of certain cultural items and remains. The applicant is also required to pay the necessary fees for permanent curation. A report documenting the analysis and fieldwork results shall be prepared and submitted to the satisfaction of the County's Director of Planning and Land Use.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> Impacts to archaeological resources would be protected to the extent feasible through the implementation of mitigation measures, including the preservation of archaeological collections.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> Impacts to archaeological resources would be protected to the extent feasible through the implementation of mitigation measures, including the preservation of archaeological collections.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> Impacts to archaeological resources would be protected to the extent feasible through the implementation of mitigation measures, including the preservation of archaeological collections.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> Impacts to archaeological resources would be protected to the extent feasible through the implementation of mitigation measures, including the preservation of archaeological collections.</p>

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
Policy COS-7.4 Consultation with Affected Communities. Require consultation with affected communities, including local tribes to determine the appropriate treatment of cultural resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> Responsible agencies have consulted with and been engaged with the Luiseño regarding the EIR and EIS. In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (Section 5P of Proposition C (MM.1.12.CP)), the applicant would retain a qualified archaeologist and, a Native American monitor, who is selected from a list of suitable candidates obtained from the Native American Heritage Commission. The archaeologist and, if appropriate, the Native American monitor shall implement a monitoring and data recovery program to the satisfaction of the County's Director of Planning and Land Use, to mitigate potential impacts to known and previously undiscovered archaeological resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> If Native American resources are identified during a preliminary survey or during any excavation or other disturbance of possible Native American site, the local tribe shall be notified and may be present to determine the appropriate treatment of resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> If Native American resources are identified during a preliminary survey or during any excavation or other disturbance of possible Native American site, the local tribe shall be notified and may be present to determine the appropriate treatment of resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> If Native American resources are identified during a preliminary survey or during any excavation or other disturbance of possible Native American site, the local tribe shall be notified and may be present to determine the appropriate treatment of resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> If Native American resources are identified during a preliminary survey or during any excavation or other disturbance of possible Native American site, the local tribe shall be notified and may be present to determine the appropriate treatment of resources.
Policy COS-7.5 Treatment of Human Remains. Require human remains be treated with the utmost dignity and respect and that the disposition and handling of human remains will be done in consultation with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) and under the requirements of Federal, State and County Regulations.	<b>Consistent.</b> Borrow/Stockpile A would be located where CA-SDI-14,607/H, the Higgins Family Cemetery, is located. Thus, this alternative would directly impact the cemetery. In accordance with incorporated design features, the applicant would be required to remove the cemetery by excavation of burials and rebury the remains in a nearby active cemetery. Exhumation and re-interment of all remains from this cemetery would be conducted in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. In the event that human remains are discovered during alternative implementation, other than those located at the Higgins Family Cemetery, the excavation or disturbance of the site would cease until procedures and requirements set forth in Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Codes for reburial are satisfied. If Native American burial sites are discovered, this alternative would comply with the Public Resources Code 5097.98 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e).	<b>Consistent.</b> Although human remains have not been identified on the property, if any human remains are discovered, the alternative will comply with the requirements of federal, state, and county regulations, including consultation with the most likely descendant.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although human remains have not been identified on the property, if any human remains are discovered, the alternative will comply with the requirements of federal, state, and county regulations, including consultation with the most likely descendant.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although human remains have not been identified on the property, if any human remains are discovered, the alternative will comply with the requirements of federal, state, and county regulations, including consultation with the most likely descendant.	<b>Consistent.</b> If any human remains are discovered, the alternative will comply with the requirements of federal, state, and county regulations, including consultation with the most likely descendant.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy COS-7.6 Cultural Resource Data Management. Coordinate with public agencies, tribes, and institutions in order to build and maintain a central database that includes a notation whether collections from each site are being curated, and if so, where, along with the nature and location of cultural resources throughout the County of San Diego.	<b>Consistent.</b> In accordance with design features set forth in the Gregory Canyon Landfill MMRP and design features set forth in the EIS measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources of the EIS), artifacts would be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards and transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County.	<b>Consistent.</b> In accordance with mitigation measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources of the EIS), artifacts would be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards and transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County.	<b>Consistent.</b> In accordance with mitigation measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources of the EIS), artifacts would be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards and transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County.	<b>Consistent.</b> In accordance with mitigation measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources of the EIS), artifacts would be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards and transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County.	<b>Consistent.</b> In accordance with mitigation measures (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources of the EIS), artifacts would be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards and transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County.
GOAL COS-8 Protection and Conservation of the Historical Built Environment. Protection, conservation, use, and enjoyment of the County's important historic resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> Existing historical built resources include the First San Diego Aqueduct. Mitigation measures set forth in Section 4.5.1, Historical and Archaeological Resources, would reduce adverse impacts to historical resources to below the criterion level.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site does not contain historical structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site does not contain historical structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site does not contain historical structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site does not contain historical structures.
Policy COS-8.1 Preservation and Adaptive Reuse. Encourage the preservation and/or adaptive reuse of historic sites, structures, and landscapes as a means of protecting important historic resources as part of the discretionary application process, and encourage the preservation of historic structures identified during the ministerial application process.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> Existing historical resources include the First San Diego Aqueduct. Mitigation measures would reduce adverse impacts to historical resources to below the criterion level.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site does not contain historical structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site does not contain historical structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site does not contain historical structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site does not contain historical structures.
Policy COS-8.2 Education and Interpretation. Encourage and promote the development of educational and interpretive programs that focus on the rich multicultural heritage of the County of San Diego.	<b>Consistent.</b> The MMRP and incorporated design features require that the property's historical resources, as applicable, would be curated and available for study (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Mitigation measures applicable to the Aspen Road site require that any recovered historical resources, as applicable, would be curated and available for study (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Mitigation measures applicable to the Gopher Canyon Road site require that any recovered historical resources, as applicable, would be curated and available for study (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Mitigation measures applicable to the Merriam Mountain site require that any recovered historical resources, as applicable, would be curated and available for study (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Mitigation measures applicable to the East Otay Mesa site require that any recovered historical resources, as applicable, would be curated and available for study (see Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIS).

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
GOAL COS-9 Educational and Scientific Uses. Paleontological resources and unique geologic features conserved for educational and/or scientific purposes.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site does not contain specific geologic features that would uniquely serve educational and/or scientific purposes. However, the site contains deposits of Quaternary alluvium which may be old enough to contain vertebrate remains of great enough antiquity to be considered fossils (i.e., greater than 10,000 years old). Such fossils may provide evolutionary and paleo-environmental information about a time in the not too distant past. The alternative includes monitoring and handling procedures for such resources, if discovered. With the implementation of required mitigation, fossils would be available for education or scientific purposes.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is underlain by crystalline igneous rock classified as a gabbro (an intrusive granitic rock) that does not contain paleontological resources. Other geologic features and outcrops are also not unique in the region.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is underlain by intrusive granitic rock that does not contain paleontological resources. Other geologic features and outcrops are also not unique in the region.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is underlain by intrusive granitic rock that does not contain paleontological resources. Other geologic features and outcrops are also not unique in the region.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is underlain by predominantly volcanic rock classified as Santiago Peak Volcanics that does not contain paleontological resources. Other geologic features and outcrops are also not unique in the region.
Policy COS-9.1 Preservation. Require the salvage and preservation of unique paleontological resources when exposed to the elements during excavation or grading activities or other development processes.	<b>Consistent.</b> The MMRP would require the salvage and preservation of any unique paleontological resources that might be exposed during excavation or grading activities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site does not contain the types of soils or rock formations that contain paleontological resources.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site does not contain the types of soils or rock formations that contain paleontological resources.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site does not contain the types of soils or rock formations that contain paleontological resources.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site does not contain the types of soils or rock formations that contain paleontological resources.
Policy COS-9.2 Impacts of Development. Require development to minimize impacts to unique geological features from human related destruction, damage, or loss.	<b>Consistent.</b> Unique geologic features on this site include visually prominent rock outcrops on the higher slopes of Gregory Mountain. The higher slope of Gregory Mountain would not be altered. However, where the landfill prism reaches rock outcrop on the mid or lower slope, these shall be retained and reused in placement along the edges of the landfill and contouring of the fill slope to help to maintain the visual integrity of the rock outcroppings on the higher slopes of Gregory Mountain. The cut face of pads for SDG&E towers on the slope of Gregory Mountain would be sculpted to allow rock outcrops to remain and be prominent. However, the site's unique geologic features, such as the outcroppings on the higher slopes of Gregory Mountain would not be removed or covered by the landfill.	<b>Consistent.</b> Unique geologic features on this site include rock outcrops on the higher slopes of the canyon. Boulders would be reused along the edges of the landfill and contouring of the fill slope to help to maintain the visual integrity of the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> Unique geologic features on this site include rock outcrops on the higher slopes of the canyon. Boulders would be reused along the edges of the landfill and contouring of the fill slope to help to maintain the visual integrity of the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> Unique geologic features on this site include rock outcrops on the higher slopes of the canyon. Boulders would be reused along the edges of the landfill and contouring of the fill slope to help to maintain the visual integrity of the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is underlain by predominantly volcanic rock that does not contain geologic features that are unique in the region.



TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
GOAL COS-10 provides for the long-term production of mineral materials adequate to meet the local County average annual demand, while maintaining permitted reserves equivalent to a 50-year supply, using operational techniques and site reclamation methods consistent with SMARA standards such that adverse effects on surrounding land uses, public health, and the environment are minimized, and Policies COS-10.1 through COS-10.9 provide for the protection of mineral resources, long-term production of mineral materials, discouragement of development that would substantially preclude the future development of mining facilities, conservation (i.e., protection from incompatible land uses) of areas designated as having substantial potential for mineral extraction, prevention of development or the establishment of other incompatible land uses on or adjacent to areas classified or designated by the State of California as having important mineral resources (MRZ-2), restriction of road access to existing mining facilities, areas classified MRZ-2 or MRZ-3, requirement of reclamation plans, conservation of construction aggregate, recycling of mining debris, creation of permit types for new mining facilities, development of overlay zones and buffer areas for MRZ-2-designated lands.	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The Gregory Canyon site is not zoned as MRZ-2, which is intended to preserve valuable mineral resources. Construction would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. Tonalite, which occurs in Gregory Canyon, could be considered a low-value mineral resource in its own right, as a source of dimension stone or crushed gravel. Landfill development would limit access to this resource, but this rock type is abundant in the Southern California batholith and development would not affect its availability. As part of the alternative, excavated rock materials from the landfill footprint would be processed on-site (i.e., crushed. Noise, vibration, and air quality impacts associated with excavation and crushing activities would be mitigated to less than significant levels (see Sections 3.2, Air Quality, and 3.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS).</p> <p>The alternative would not use sand and gravel materials contained in the San Luis Rey River. Mineral resources located in the San Luis Rey River would continue to be preserved under the MRZ-2 designation, which encompasses large segments of the San Luis Rey River (not located on this site). The proposed alternative will not impact the operation of existing sand and gravel mining operations located near this site or affect the development of future sand and gravel mining operations in the area.</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable.</b> The Aspen Road site is not located in an area designated as having mineral resources. That is, it is not zoned as an MRZ-2 zone intended to preserve valuable mineral resources by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The Gopher Canyon Road Alternative site lies adjacent to an existing quarry and overlaps an area designated as MRZ-2, i.e. having known resources. The area has been mined over the years for cutting and polishing of granite, granite saws, extraction and processing of dimension stone, and aggregate mining. One of the stockpiles locations would be placed within the existing mining area. Conversion of the area to landfill activities could affect access to the currently mined granite resources, which would be considered a potentially significant impact on the availability of mineral resources. A mitigation measure for this alternative includes the relocation of the stockpile, which would maintain access to the mineral resource. Because access could be maintained with the recommended mitigation measure, the alternative would be consistent with this goal.</p>	<p><b>Not Consistent.</b> The Merriam Mountain Alternative site is located in an area that is mostly designated as MRZ-2, i.e. resources present, reflecting the suitability of the site for providing aggregate/construction material. There is also an existing area that was formerly a quarry site, designated as MRZ-2 and zoned for mining by the County that lies just to the west of the proposed landfill prism. This western stockpile could extend into this area. Conversion of the area to landfill activities could affect access to the currently mined granite resources, which would be considered a potentially significant impact on the availability of mineral resources. As such, this alternative would not be consistent with the goal to provide for long-term production of minerals. Because the mineral the resource is ubiquitous within the landfill area, there are no mitigation measures that would ensure future access. Therefore, the alternative would not be consistent with this goal.</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located in an area designated as having mineral resources. That is, it is not zoned as an MRZ-2 zone intended to preserve valuable mineral resources by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology.</p>
GOAL COS-11 Preservation of Scenic Resources. Preservation of scenic resources, including vistas of important natural and unique features, where visual impacts of development are minimized.	<p><b>Partially Consistent.</b> Components of the alternative, including the Borrow/Stockpile areas, the exposed landfill face, bridge construction, removal of oak trees and vegetation, the exposed cut for the desilting basin, and construction of maintenance roads and pads for the SDG&amp;E transmission lines would impact this site's scenic resources (existing vegetation and quality of the view of Gregory Mountain) and existing visual character. Although impacts would be reduced through incorporated design features, including landscaping to</p>	<p><b>Partially Consistent.</b> Components of the alternative, including the exposed landfill prism and removal of vegetation would impact the area's scenic resources and existing visual character. Aesthetic impacts would be reduced through mitigation measures, including landscaping to screen various elements placement of large natural boulders around structures, landscaping to cover bare earth areas, painting of structures and pipelines to blend into natural colors and textures, staining of concrete for ditches and</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> Components of the alternative, including the exposed landfill face and removal of vegetation would impact the area's scenic resources and existing visual character. Aesthetic impacts would be reduced through mitigation measures, including landscaping to screen various elements placement of large natural boulders around structures, landscaping to cover bare earth areas, painting of structures and pipelines to blend into natural colors and textures,</p>	<p><b>Not Consistent.</b> Components of the alternative, including the exposed landfill prism and removal of vegetation would impact the area's scenic resources and existing visual character. Aesthetic impacts would be reduced through mitigation measures, including landscaping to screen various elements placement of large natural boulders around structures, landscaping to cover bare earth areas, painting of structures and pipelines to blend into natural colors and textures, staining of concrete for ditches and</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> Components of the alternative, including the exposed landfill face and removal of vegetation would impact the area's scenic resources and existing visual character. Aesthetic impacts would be reduced through mitigation measures, including landscaping to screen various elements placement of large natural boulders around structures, landscaping to cover bare earth areas, painting of structures and pipelines to blend into natural colors and textures, staining of concrete for ditches and</p>

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
	screen various alternative elements and to block views of the site from SR 76, placement of large natural boulders around structures, landscaping to cover bare earth areas, painting of structures and pipelines to blend into natural colors and textures, staining of concrete for ditches and culverts, contouring graded areas to resemble or blend into adjacent natural topography. However, because the landfill prism would be massive and visible from SR 76, a County-designated scenic highway, the impact to natural landform character would not be mitigated to a less than significant level. Thus, the alternative would only be partially consistent with the goal to preserve scenic resources.	culverts, contouring graded areas to resemble or blend into adjacent natural topography. However, because the landfill prism would be massive and encroach into ridgeline views, the impact to natural landform character would not be mitigated to a less than adverse level. Thus, the alternative would only be partially consistent with the goal to preserve scenic resources.	staining of concrete for ditches and culverts, contouring graded areas to resemble or blend into adjacent natural topography. Because the landfill prism would not encroach into ridgeline views, aesthetic impacts would be mitigated to a less than adverse level. Thus, the alternative would be consistent with the goal to preserve scenic resources.	culverts, contouring graded areas to resemble or blend into adjacent natural topography. However, because the landfill prism would be massive and encroach into ridgeline views, the impact to natural landform character would not be mitigated to a less than adverse level. Thus, the alternative would be consistent with the goal to preserve scenic resources.	culverts, contouring graded areas to resemble or blend into adjacent natural topography. Because the landfill prism would not encroach into ridgeline views, aesthetic impacts would be mitigated to a less than adverse level. Thus, the alternative would be consistent with the goal to preserve scenic resources.
Policy COS-11.1 Protection of Scenic Resources. Require the protection of scenic highways, corridors, regionally significant scenic vistas, and natural features, including prominent ridgelines, dominant landforms, reservoirs, and scenic landscapes.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> SR 76 is listed as a County Scenic Highway. The alternative would include the retention of the existing knoll north of the facilities area to help screen views of the site from SR 76. In addition, a design feature requires that existing trees and shrubs along SR 76 be saved and supplemented to create a naturally landscaped transportation corridor through the property. Blending of created landforms with adjacent landforms would be achieved by manipulating the landform to resemble or meld with its surroundings, planting to create the pattern resembling the adjacent vegetation matrix and its colors, and incorporating boulders into the final grades to re-create the rocky texture of the surrounding hillsides. Areas within view of SR 76, adjacent to the ancillary facilities area would be revegetated with both oak woodland habitats and riparian plantings to mitigate for the loss of visual resources. Wherever possible, boulders and rock outcrops would be relocated from disturbed areas to replanted areas. Large riparian trees along the river corridor and bridge, along with the associated understory found within these riparian zones, would be planted to screen landfill elements and the excavation in accordance with the landscape plan. Areas adjacent to the ancillary facilities	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> Components of the alternative, including the exposed landfill face and removal of vegetation would impact the area's scenic resources. Impacts to scenic resources would be mitigated through revegetation and contouring and mounding of the landfill mass. However, the landfill mass would dominate prominent ridgelines and, thus, adversely affect scenic landscapes and scenic vistas. Thus, the alternative would only be partially consistent with the policy to protect scenic resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> Components of the alternative, including the exposed landfill face and removal of vegetation would impact the area's scenic resources. The landfill mass would not dominate prominent ridgelines or be visible from any designated scenic highway. In addition, impacts to scenic resources would be mitigated through revegetation and contouring and mounding of the landfill mass. Thus, the alternative would be consistent with the policy to preserve scenic resources.	<b>Partially Consistent.</b> Components of the alternative, including the exposed landfill face and removal of vegetation would impact the area's scenic resources. The landfill mass would not dominate prominent ridgelines and be visible from I-15, a designated scenic corridor. Although impacts to scenic resources would be mitigated through revegetation and contouring and mounding of the landfill mass, the alternative would be only partially consistent with the policy to preserve scenic resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> Components of the alternative, including the exposed landfill face and removal of vegetation would impact the area's scenic resources. The landfill mass would not dominate prominent ridgelines or be visible from any designated scenic highway. In addition, impacts to scenic resources would be mitigated through revegetation and contouring and mounding of the landfill mass. Thus, the alternative would be consistent with the policy to preserve scenic resources.

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
	area and next to the water tank would be planted with mature trees in major tree groupings. In addition, disturbed slopes would be revegetated with native species. Landscape plans would include vegetative screening on the side slopes and in areas below the crest to screen the grading for the western desilting basin. Landform screening would be implemented, including major tree groupings, at the edges of Borrow/Stockpile Areas A and B to help block the views of the area. Gentle grading and curvilinear shapes would be used to help blend top and side slopes in with the natural topography. However, even with the incorporation of design features (see Section 4.1, Aesthetics, of the EIS), the alternative would alter the visual character of the site as viewed from SR 76. Thus, the alternative would only be partially consistent with the goal to preserve scenic resources.				
Policy COS-11.3 Development Siting and Design. Require development within visually sensitive areas to minimize visual impacts and to preserve unique or special visual features, particularly in rural areas, through the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Creative site planning</li><li>- Integration of natural features into the alternative</li><li>- Appropriate scale, materials, and design to complement the surrounding natural landscape</li><li>- Minimal disturbance of topography</li><li>- Clustering of development so as to preserve a balance of open space vistas, natural features, and community character.</li><li>- Creation of contiguous open space networks</li></ul>	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate a conceptual landscape plan that would integrate natural features, including revegetation of upland woodland tree groupings to screen components from the highway and other view locations. The grading plan would include the blending of created landforms (such as the face of the landfill) with adjacent landforms through manipulation to resemble or meld with its surroundings, planting to create the pattern resembling the adjacent vegetation matrix and its colors, and incorporating boulders into the final grades to create the rocky texture of the surrounding hillsides. Contouring of landforms to help blend the general forms of land masses on part of the lower stockpile areas and gentle grading and curvilinear shapes would be used to help blend top and side slopes in with the natural topography. A HRRMP would be implemented as well as the preservation of a minimum of 1,313 acres of permanent open space. Although the creation of the landfill would cause a major disturbance of natural topography, the design features	<b>Consistent.</b> Mitigation measures associated with the alternative would require that the alternative replant graded areas with native vegetation, install tree groupings for screening, blend engineered sloped with natural hillsides, incorporate boulders into the setting, and paint structures and pipes to blend into the natural landscape. The design features to minimize impacts to visual resources would be consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> Mitigation measures associated with the alternative would require that the alternative replant graded areas with native vegetation, install tree groupings for screening, blend engineered sloped with natural hillsides, incorporate boulders into the setting, and paint structures and pipes to blend into the natural landscape. The design features to minimize impacts to visual resources would be consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> Mitigation measures associated with the alternative would require that the alternative replant graded areas with native vegetation, install tree groupings for screening, blend engineered sloped with natural hillsides, incorporate boulders into the setting, and paint structures and pipes to blend into the natural landscape. The design features to minimize impacts to visual resources would be consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> Mitigation measures associated with the alternative would require that the alternative replant graded areas with native vegetation, install tree groupings for screening, blend engineered sloped with natural hillsides, incorporate boulders into the setting, and paint structures and pipes to blend into the natural landscape. The design features to minimize impacts to visual resources would be consistent with this policy.

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
	to minimize impacts to visual resources would be consistent with this policy.				
Policies COS-11.4, Collaboration with Agencies and Jurisdictions. Coordinate with adjacent federal and State agencies, local jurisdictions, and tribal governments to protect scenic resources and corridors that extend beyond the County's land use authority, but are important to the welfare of County residents.	<b>Consistent.</b> This policy applies to the County's consultation with agencies and jurisdictions. Relative to this, under Proposition C, the agencies collaborated to ensure the dedication of 1,313 acres of open space, conceptual landscaping, re-seeding, grading techniques that contour graded surfaces, and other techniques to protect scenic resources to the extent feasible.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to the consultation between agencies and jurisdictions. Although the applicant would consult with agencies, this policy would not be applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to the consultation between agencies and jurisdictions. Although the applicant would consult with agencies, this policy would not be applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to the consultation between agencies and jurisdictions. Although the applicant would consult with agencies, this policy would not be applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to the consultation between agencies and jurisdictions. Although the applicant would consult with agencies, this policy would not be applicable.
COS-11.5. Collaboration with Private and Public Agencies. Coordinate with the California Public Utilities Commission, power companies, and other public agencies to avoid siting energy generation, transmission facilities, and other public improvements in locations that impact visually sensitive areas, whenever feasible. Require the design of public improvements within visually sensitive areas to blend into the landscape.	<b>Consistent.</b> This policy applies to the County's consultation with private and public agencies for the siting of public utilities. However, relative to this Gregory Canyon, Ltd. (a private company) has coordinated with SDG&E regarding the relocation of the SDG&E towers to a higher location on the west flank of Gregory Mountain. In collaboration with SDG&E, the applicant would minimize the pad areas needed for the relocated towers. Related cut slopes would be permanently revegetated and landform grading techniques would be used to blend the pads in with adjacent landforms. The cut face of these pads would be sculpted to allow rock outcrops to remain and be prominent. Additional rock outcrops would be placed where they do not interfere with the access and maintenance requirements of the towers.	<b>Consistent.</b> The applicant would consult with public utilities for the relocation of an 8-inch water line that underlies the property and any other utilities that would require relocation.	<b>Consistent.</b> The applicant would consult with public utilities for the relocation of any utility lines that cross the property; however, no known utility lines transect the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The applicant would consult with public utilities for the relocation of any utility lines that cross the property; however, no known utility lines transect the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The applicant would consult with public utilities for the relocation of any utility lines that cross the property; however, no known utility lines transect the site.
Policy COS-11.6 Billboards. Prohibit new billboards and other forms of large-scale advertising and signage within scenic corridors. Encourage the removal of existing billboards and other forms of large-scale advertising and signage along State and County scenic highway corridors.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is located along SR 76, a County-designated scenic highway. However, no billboards or other form of large scale signage are proposed in association with the alternative.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is located near I-15, a County-designated scenic corridor. However, no billboards or other form of large scale signage are proposed in association with the alternative.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is located near I-15, a County-designated scenic corridor. However, no billboards or other form of large scale signage are proposed in association with the alternative.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is located near I-15, a County-designated scenic corridor. However, no billboards or other form of large scale signage are proposed in association with the alternative.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> SR 125 and SR 905 are not designated scenic highways. No other scenic highways or roadways are located in the area.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy COS-11.7 Underground Utilities. Require new development to place utilities underground and encourage “undergrounding” in existing development to maintain viewsheds, reduce hazards associated with hanging lines and utility poles, and to keep pace with current and future technologies.	<b>Consistent.</b> New utility connections would be undergrounded in the access road from SR 76 to the facilities area. A water line from new wells north of SR 76 to tanks on at this site (south of SR 76) may run along the bridge (strapped to bridge) rather than underground. However, this line would be underground within the public right-of-way. A component of this alternative is the relocation of the existing high transmission SDG&E power lines and easement. However, the presence of these lines on the site is an existing condition and does not apply to electrical power serving this site.	<b>Consistent.</b> New utility lines would be placed underground along the alignment of the new access road.	<b>Consistent.</b> New utility lines would be placed underground along the alignment of the new access road.	<b>Consistent.</b> New utility lines would be placed underground along the alignment of the new access road.	<b>Consistent.</b> New utility lines would be placed underground along the alignment of the new access road.
GOAL COS-12 Preservation of Ridgelines and Hillsides. Ridgelines and steep hillsides that are preserved for their character and scenic value.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The proposed landfill would be located along the west flank of Gregory Mountain, which would change the visibility and appearance of the hillside. However, the landfill would not extend to the upper reaches of Gregory Mountain or change the visual character of the ridgeline. By preserving the ridgeline and blending the created landform (landfill face) with the existing landforms to resemble or meld with its surroundings, planting to create the pattern resembling the adjacent vegetation matrix and its colors, and incorporating boulders into the final grades to create the rocky texture of the surrounding hillsides. However, because the alternative would alter the natural landform character of the hillside, it would not be consistent with this policy.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The landfill prism would rise over and dominate the natural ridgeline as viewed from the area north of the Santa Margarita River and other viewpoints. Because the alternative would alter the natural landform character of the ridgeline view, it would not be consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> With proposed mitigation, the landfill would not significantly alter ridgeline views or the natural landform character of the area. Therefore, this alternative would be consistent with this policy.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The landfill prism would rise over and dominate the natural ridgeline as viewed I-15, a County-designated scenic highway corridor. Because the alternative would alter the natural landform character of the ridgeline view, it would not be consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill would not significantly alter ridgeline views or the natural landform character of the area. Therefore, this alternative would be consistent with this policy
GOAL COS-13 Dark Skies. Preserve dark skies that contribute to rural character and are necessary for the local observatories.	<b>Consistent.</b> The operation of the landfill would take place during daytime hours and would not require flood lighting or spot lighting during the evening or nighttime hours. All on-site lighting would be directed downward for security purposes and would not be a significant source of light. Lighting would be consistent with the County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110) and would reduce glare and would not increase ambient lighting in the area and region.	<b>Consistent.</b> The operation of the landfill would take place during daytime hours and would not require flood lighting or spot lighting during the evening or nighttime hours. All on-site lighting would be directed downward for security purposes and would not be a significant source of light. Lighting would be consistent with the County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110) and would reduce glare and would not increase ambient lighting in the area and region.	<b>Consistent.</b> The operation of the landfill would take place during daytime hours and would not require flood lighting or spot lighting during the evening or nighttime hours. All on-site lighting would be directed downward for security purposes and would not be a significant source of light. Lighting would be consistent with the County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110) and would reduce glare and would not increase ambient lighting in the area and region.	<b>Consistent.</b> The operation of the landfill would take place during daytime hours and would not require flood lighting or spot lighting during the evening or nighttime hours. All on-site lighting would be directed downward for security purposes and would not be a significant source of light. Lighting would be consistent with the County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110) and would reduce glare and would not increase ambient lighting in the area and region.	<b>Consistent.</b> The operation of the landfill would take place during daytime hours and would not require flood lighting or spot lighting during the evening or nighttime hours. All on-site lighting would be directed downward for security purposes and would not be a significant source of light. Lighting would be consistent with the County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110) and would reduce glare and would not increase ambient lighting in the area and region.

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
Policy COS-13.1 Restrict Light and Glare. Restrict outdoor light and glare from development projects in Semi-Rural and Rural Land and designated rural communities to retain the quality of night skies by minimizing light pollution.	<b>Consistent.</b> The operation of the landfill would take place during daytime hours and would not require outdoor lighting during the evening/ nighttime hours. Lighting would consist of directed lighting for security, which would be consistent with the semi-rural setting (mix of agricultural, industrial, and mining uses) in which the site is located. All lighting for the operation of the landfill would be consistent with the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110) and, thus, consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> All lighting for the operation of the landfill would be consistent with the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110) and, thus, consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> All lighting for the operation of the landfill would be consistent with the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110) and, thus, consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> All lighting for the operation of the landfill would be consistent with the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110) and, thus, consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> All lighting for the operation of the landfill would be consistent with the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110) and, thus, consistent with this policy.
Policy COS-13.2 Palomar and Mount Laguna. Minimize, to the maximum extent feasible, the impact of development on the dark skies surrounding Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories to maintain dark skies which are vital to these two world-class observatories by restricting exterior light sources within the impact areas of the observatories.	<b>Consistent.</b> All lighting for the operation of the landfill would be consistent with the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110), which establishes lamp and shielding requirements and hours of operation standards that have been determined to effectively reduce impacts on dark skies. The standards are the result of a collaborative effort from technical lighting experts, astronomers, and County staff to effectively address and minimize the impact of light pollution on dark skies. The Code was written specifically to ensure that new outdoor lighting would have minimal impacts on astronomical observatories and would be consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> All lighting for the operation of the landfill would be consistent with the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110), which establishes lamp and shielding requirements and hours of operation standards that have been determined to effectively reduce impacts on dark skies.	<b>Consistent.</b> All lighting for the operation of the landfill would be consistent with the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110), which establishes lamp and shielding requirements and hours of operation standards that have been determined to effectively reduce impacts on dark skies.	<b>Consistent.</b> All lighting for the operation of the landfill would be consistent with the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110), which establishes lamp and shielding requirements and hours of operation standards that have been determined to effectively reduce impacts on dark skies.	<b>Consistent.</b> All lighting for the operation of the landfill would be consistent with the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110), which establishes lamp and shielding requirements and hours of operation standards that have been determined to effectively reduce impacts on dark skies.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
GOAL COS-14 Sustainable Land Development. Land use development techniques and patterns that reduce emissions of criteria pollutants and GHGs through minimized transportation and energy demands, while protecting public health and contributing to a more sustainable environment.	<b>Consistent.</b> Waste collection would generate a high demand for fuel and haul trucks to the landfill would contribute air pollutants to the regional air basin. However, the regional emissions (related to vehicle miles) from waste hauling to the landfill would likely decrease relative to the emissions resulting from current waste hauling practices. The proposed facility is closer to waste generators in North County, which constitute approximately 24 percent of the County's solid waste. The location of the site in the North County would also reduce the practice of transporting solid waste to out-of-County landfills. Because of the potential reduction in transport miles, the alternative would be consistent with this goal.	<b>Consistent.</b> Waste collection would generate a high demand for fuel and haul trucks to the landfill would contribute air pollutants to the regional air basin. However, the regional emissions (related to vehicle miles) from waste hauling to the landfill would likely decrease relative to the emissions resulting from current waste hauling practices. The proposed facility is closer to waste generators in North County, which constitute approximately 24 percent of the County's solid waste. The location of the site in the North County would also reduce the practice of transporting solid waste to out-of-County landfills. Because of the potential reduction in transport miles, the alternative would be consistent with this goal.	<b>Consistent.</b> Waste collection would generate a high demand for fuel and haul trucks to the landfill would contribute air pollutants to the regional air basin. However, the regional emissions (related to vehicle miles) from waste hauling to the landfill would likely decrease relative to the emissions resulting from current waste hauling practices. The proposed facility is closer to waste generators in North County, which constitute approximately 24 percent of the County's solid waste. The location of the site in the North County would also reduce the practice of transporting solid waste to out-of-County landfills. Because of the potential reduction in transport miles, the alternative would be consistent with this goal.	<b>Consistent.</b> Waste collection would generate a high demand for fuel and haul trucks to the landfill would contribute air pollutants to the regional air basin. However, the regional emissions (related to vehicle miles) from waste hauling to the landfill would likely decrease relative to the emissions resulting from current waste hauling practices. The proposed facility is closer to waste generators in North County, which constitute approximately 24 percent of the County's solid waste. The location of the site in the North County would also reduce the practice of transporting solid waste to out-of-County. Because of the potential reduction in transport miles, the alternative would be consistent with this goal.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> Waste collection would generate a high demand for fuel and haul trucks to the landfill would contribute air pollutants to the regional air basin. This alternative would increase the length of waste transport trips from northern San Diego County jurisdictions. Regional emissions from waste hauling to the East Otay Mesa Alternative would increase relative to the emissions resulting from current waste hauling practices, because of the proposed facility's location in South County. Because the North County constitutes approximately 24 percent of the County's solid waste, the relative increase would be substantial.
Policy COS-14.3 Sustainable Development. Require design of residential subdivisions and nonresidential development through "green" and sustainable land development practices to conserve energy, water, open space, and natural resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although a landfill is not, by definition, a sustainable use, the applicant would follow certain practices to improve sustainability. For example, water required for dust control during operation would be substantially reduced through the use of the soil sealant. The alternative would also include a recycling and resource recovery drop-off area for source separated recyclables. Reclaimed water could be used at the landfill, particularly if water demands were to exceed safe yields from the basin (onsite wells). Thus, the landfill would not affect domestic supplies. Also to improve sustainability, the alternative would provide a minimum of 1,313 acres of permanent open space for long-term restoration and preservation of sensitive habitat and species.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although a landfill is not, by definition, a sustainable use, the applicant would follow certain practices to improve sustainability. For example, alternative water required for dust control during alternative operation would be substantially reduced through the use of the currently proposed soil sealant. The alternative would also encourage recycling and resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables. Although the use of reclaimed water is not currently proposed for use at the landfill, the recycled water would be considered if it becomes available.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although a landfill is not, by definition, a sustainable use, the applicant would follow certain practices to improve sustainability. For example, alternative water required for dust control during alternative operation would be substantially reduced through the use of the currently proposed soil sealant. The alternative would also encourage recycling and resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables. Although the use of reclaimed water is not currently proposed for use at the landfill, the recycled water would be considered if it becomes available.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although a landfill is not, by definition, a sustainable use, the applicant would follow certain practices to improve sustainability. For example, alternative water required for dust control during alternative operation would be substantially reduced through the use of the currently proposed soil sealant. The alternative would also encourage recycling and resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables. Although the use of reclaimed water is not currently proposed for use at the landfill, the recycled water would be considered if it becomes available.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although a landfill is not, by definition, a sustainable use, the applicant would follow certain practices to improve sustainability. For example, alternative water required for dust control during alternative operation would be substantially reduced through the use of the currently proposed soil sealant. The alternative would also encourage recycling and resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables. Although the use of reclaimed water is not currently proposed for use at the landfill, the recycled water would be considered if it becomes available.



**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy COS-14.4 Sustainable Technology and projects. Require technologies and projects that contribute to the conservation of resources in a sustainable manner, that are compatible with community character, and that increase the self-sufficiency of individual communities, residents, and businesses.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described under COS-14.3, above, the alternative would implement available technologies and procedures to improve sustainability. With respect to community character, landfills are a special purpose use and considered neither urban nor rural, but rather an infrastructure element. However, design features would be implemented to improve aesthetics and consistency with community character.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described under COS-14.3, above, the alternative would implement available technologies and procedures to improve sustainability. With respect to community character, landfills are a special purpose use and considered neither urban nor rural, but rather an infrastructure element. However, design features would be implemented to improve aesthetics and consistency with community character.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described under COS-14.3, above, the alternative would implement available technologies and procedures to improve sustainability. With respect to community character, landfills are a special purpose use and considered neither urban nor rural, but rather an infrastructure element. However, design features would be implemented to improve aesthetics and consistency with community character.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described under COS-14.3, above, the alternative would implement available technologies and procedures to improve sustainability. With respect to community character, landfills are a special purpose use and considered neither urban nor rural, but rather an infrastructure element. However, design features would be implemented to improve aesthetics and consistency with community character.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described under COS-14.3, above, the alternative would implement available technologies and procedures to improve sustainability. With respect to community character, landfills are a special purpose use and considered neither urban nor rural, but rather an infrastructure element. However, design features would be implemented to improve aesthetics and consistency with community character.
Policy COS-14.8 Minimize Air Pollution. Minimize land use conflicts that expose people to significant amounts of air pollutants.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be located away from the North County's urban centers, which would minimize the number of residents to site-generated mobile and stationary emissions (see Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, in the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be located away from the North County's urban centers, which would minimize the number of residents exposed to site-generated mobile and stationary emissions (see Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, in the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be located away from the North County's urban centers, which would minimize the number of residents exposed to site-generated mobile and stationary emissions (see Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, in the EIS). However, this site is in closer proximity to a concentration of residence (semi-rural), than other alternatives.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be located away from the North County's urban centers, which would minimize the number of residents exposed to site-generated mobile and stationary emissions (see Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, in the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be located away from South County's urban centers, which would minimize the number of residents exposed to site-generated mobile and stationary emissions (see Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, in the EIS).
Policy COS-14.9 Significant Producers of Air Pollutants. Require projects that generate potentially significant levels of air pollutants and/or GHGs such as quarries, landfill operations, or large land development projects to incorporate renewable energy, and the best available control technologies and practices into this alternative design.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would exceed state standards for PM <sub>10</sub> emissions primarily caused by fugitive dust (operation) and NOx emissions (primarily caused by off-road vehicle exhaust (construction) and equipment exhaust (operation). Since these generation levels are not caused by high energy demand, the use of renewable energy as an emissions reduction for fugitive dust, off-road mobile emissions, and equipment exhaust, would not be applicable. As described in Section 4.3, Air Quality, of the EIS, the best control technologies would be implemented in this alternative design. In addition, the location of the landfill in the North County would reduce vehicle emissions compared to current practices of transporting solid waste to other areas of the County or out of county.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would exceed state standards for PM <sub>10</sub> emissions primarily caused by fugitive dust (operation) and NOx emissions (primarily caused by off-road vehicle exhaust (construction) and equipment exhaust (operation). Since these generation levels are not caused by high energy demand, the use of renewable energy as an emissions reduction method would not be applicable. The best control technologies would be implemented in this alternative design. In addition, the location of the landfill in the North County would reduce vehicle emissions compared to current practices of transporting solid waste to other areas of the County or out of county.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would exceed state standards for PM <sub>10</sub> emissions primarily caused by fugitive dust (operation) and NOx emissions (primarily caused by off-road vehicle exhaust (construction) and equipment exhaust (operation). Since these generation levels are not caused by high energy demand, the use of renewable energy as an emissions reduction method would not be applicable. The best control technologies would be implemented in this alternative design. In addition, the location of the landfill in the North County would reduce vehicle emissions compared to current practices of transporting solid waste to other areas of the County or out of county.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would exceed state standards for PM <sub>10</sub> emissions primarily caused by fugitive dust (operation) and NOx emissions (primarily caused by off-road vehicle exhaust (construction) and equipment exhaust (operation). Since these generation levels are not caused by high energy demand, the use of renewable energy as an emissions reduction method would not be applicable. The best control technologies would be implemented in this alternative design. In addition, the location of the landfill in the North County would reduce vehicle emissions compared to current practices of transporting solid waste to other areas of the County or out of county.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The alternative would exceed state standards for PM <sub>10</sub> emissions primarily caused by fugitive dust (operation) and NOx emissions (primarily caused by off-road vehicle exhaust (construction) and equipment exhaust (operation). Since these generation levels are not caused by high energy demand, the use of renewable energy as an emissions reduction method would not be applicable. The best control technologies would be implemented in this alternative design. However, because the landfill would be located in South County, it would continue the practice of hauling North County waste greater distances as under current practices. Therefore, this alternative would not be consistent with County objectives to reduce GHG and other emissions.



TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
Policy COS-14.10 Low-Emission Construction Vehicles and Equipment. Require County contractors and encourage other developers to use low-emission construction vehicles and equipment to improve air quality and reduce GHG emissions.	<b>Consistent.</b> Design features require the use of construction equipment that meets California Exhaust Emission Standards for Post-1996 Off-Road Compression-Ignition Engines (see Section 4.3, Air Quality and GHG Emissions, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> Design features require the use of construction equipment that meets California Exhaust Emission Standards for Post-1996 Off-Road Compression-Ignition Engines.	<b>Consistent.</b> Design features require the use of construction equipment that meets California Exhaust Emission Standards for Post-1996 Off-Road Compression-Ignition Engines.	<b>Consistent.</b> Design features require the use of construction equipment that meets California Exhaust Emission Standards for Post-1996 Off-Road Compression-Ignition Engines.	<b>Consistent.</b> Design features require the use of construction equipment that meets California Exhaust Emission Standards for Post-1996 Off-Road Compression-Ignition Engines.
Policy COS-14.11 Native Vegetation. Require development to minimize the vegetation management of native vegetation while ensuring sufficient clearing is provided for fire control.	<b>Consistent.</b> Approximately 75 percent of this site would be maintained as open space for the preservation and restoration of native vegetation. At closure, the entire site would be to open space that would support native vegetation. Sensitive native species lost as result of construction and operation (landfill footprint, borrow sites, operational facilities) would be replaced. Because this site contains native vegetation and is contiguous to open space areas containing native vegetation, it has a potentially high fire risk. However, the Fire Prevention and Control measures outlined in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection, of the EIS, would reduce fire threat. Design features include: no burning of refuse; a 150 foot minimum clearance firebreak around the perimeters of the landfill footprint; application of daily and intermediate cover; checking of loads for smoldering or burning wastes; immediate covering of any fire with soil; etc. If water is needed for fire suppression, water would be available from on-site water trucks and from the proposed 20,000-gallon water tank on-site, located adjacent to the ancillary facilities area. The alternative is located in the County Service Area (CSA) No. 135 and remains in the North County Fire Protection District's (NCFPD) sphere of influence. These agencies would be notified of all fires occurring on the site and the status of the incident. The State Water Resources Control Board has adopted comprehensive regulations (Subchapter 15) for landfill design and construction which include requirements for monitoring and control of methane gas releases. The probability of a fire being ignited from methane gas is substantially reduced due to the	<b>Consistent.</b> Graded areas would be replanted with native vegetation. Because this site contains native vegetation and is contiguous to open space areas containing native vegetation, it has a potentially high fire risk. Fire Prevention and Control measures outlined in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection, would reduce fire threat. Measures include a 150 foot minimum clearance firebreak around the perimeters of the landfill footprint. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board has adopted comprehensive regulations for landfill design and construction which include requirements for monitoring and control of methane gas releases. The probability of a fire being ignited from methane gas is substantially reduced due to the landfill's gas recovery system, which would create a considerable margin of safety over and above the established state standards. In addition, the application of daily and intermediate cover limits the amount of oxygen available for combustion. Landfill personnel would have the necessary resources to combat any on-site surface fire. Any surface fire that occurs would either be extinguished with on-site fire extinguishers or by isolating the burning materials from any surrounding flammable materials and covering with soil using a dozer.	<b>Consistent.</b> Graded areas would be replanted with native vegetation. Because this site contains native vegetation and is contiguous to open space areas containing native vegetation, it has a potentially high fire risk. Fire Prevention and Control measures outlined in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection, would reduce fire threat. Measures include a 150 foot minimum clearance firebreak around the perimeters of the landfill footprint. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board has adopted comprehensive regulations for landfill design and construction which include requirements for monitoring and control of methane gas releases. The probability of a fire being ignited from methane gas is substantially reduced due to the landfill's gas recovery system, which would create a considerable margin of safety over and above the established state standards. In addition, the application of daily and intermediate cover limits the amount of oxygen available for combustion. Landfill personnel would have the necessary resources to combat any on-site surface fire. Any surface fire that occurs would either be extinguished with on-site fire extinguishers or by isolating the burning materials from any surrounding flammable materials and covering with soil using a dozer.	<b>Consistent.</b> Graded areas would be replanted with native vegetation. Because this site contains native vegetation and is contiguous to open space areas containing native vegetation, it has a potentially high fire risk. Fire Prevention and Control measures outlined in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection, would reduce fire threat. Measures include a 150 foot minimum clearance firebreak around the perimeters of the landfill footprint. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board has adopted comprehensive regulations for landfill design and construction which include requirements for monitoring and control of methane gas releases. The probability of a fire being ignited from methane gas is substantially reduced due to the landfill's gas recovery system, which would create a considerable margin of safety over and above the established state standards. In addition, the application of daily and intermediate cover limits the amount of oxygen available for combustion. Landfill personnel would have the necessary resources to combat any on-site surface fire. Any surface fire that occurs would either be extinguished with on-site fire extinguishers or by isolating the burning materials from any surrounding flammable materials and covering with soil using a dozer.	<b>Consistent.</b> Graded areas would be replanted with native vegetation. Because this site contains native vegetation and is contiguous to open space areas containing native vegetation, it has a potentially high fire risk. Fire Prevention and Control measures outlined in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection, would reduce fire threat. Measures include a 150 foot minimum clearance firebreak around the perimeters of the landfill footprint. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board has adopted comprehensive regulations for landfill design and construction which include requirements for monitoring and control of methane gas releases. The probability of a fire being ignited from methane gas is substantially reduced due to the landfill's gas recovery system, which would create a considerable margin of safety over and above the established state standards. In addition, the application of daily and intermediate cover limits the amount of oxygen available for combustion. Landfill personnel would have the necessary resources to combat any on-site surface fire. Any surface fire that occurs would either be extinguished with on-site fire extinguishers or by isolating the burning materials from any surrounding flammable materials and covering with soil using a dozer.

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
	landfill's gas recovery system, which would create a considerable margin of safety over and above the established state standards. In addition, the application of daily and intermediate cover limits the amount of oxygen available for combustion. Any surface fire that occurs would either be extinguished with on-site fire extinguishers or by isolating the burning materials from any surrounding flammable materials and covering with soil using a dozer.				
Policy COS-14.12 Heat Island Effect. Require that development be located and designed to minimize the “heat island” effect as appropriate to the location and density of development, incorporating such elements as cool roofs, cool pavements, and strategically placed shade trees.	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill prism would alter the landform on the site, and have the potential to cause microclimate changes in the area. However, because the size of the prism (193 acres) compared to the overall basin floor of the canyon (12,000 acres) is fractional (1.5 percent) when compared to the volume and movement of air into the valley no significant change in temperature is expected. An assessment of the potential temperature change suggests a less than a one degree Fahrenheit temperature drop could occur in the landfill footprint area. This is not a significant temperature change. (see Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill prism would alter the landform on the site, and have the potential to cause microclimate changes in the area. However, because the size of the prism (165 acres) compared to the surrounding region, the expected temperature change would minimal (see Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the EIS). An assessment of the potential temperature change suggests a less than a one degree Fahrenheit temperature drop could occur in the landfill footprint area. This is not a significant temperature change. (see Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill prism would alter the landform on the site, and have the potential to cause microclimate changes in the area. However, because the size of the prism (180 acres) compared to the surrounding region, the expected temperature change would minimal. An assessment of the potential temperature change suggests a less than a one degree Fahrenheit temperature drop could occur in the landfill footprint area. This is not a significant temperature change. (see Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill prism would alter the landform on the site, and have the potential to cause microclimate changes in the area. However, because the size of the prism (199 acres) compared to the surrounding region, the expected temperature change would minimal. An assessment of the potential temperature change suggests a less than a one degree Fahrenheit temperature drop could occur in the landfill footprint area. This is not a significant temperature change. (see Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill prism would alter the landform on the site, and have the potential to cause microclimate changes in the area. However, because the size of the prism (146 acres) compared to the surrounding region, the expected temperature change would minimal. An assessment of the potential temperature change suggests a less than a one degree Fahrenheit temperature drop could occur in the landfill footprint area. This is not a significant temperature change. (see Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the EIS).
GOAL COS-15 and Policies COS-15-1 through COS-15.6 apply to the architectural design and construction of sustainable buildings, upgrade of existing buildings, green building programs (LEEDS), Title 24 building standards, energy efficiency in new development, design and construction methods.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed administrative building, two fee booths, and a 7,000 square-foot concrete maintenance building would be the only occupied structures on the site. These buildings, however, would be constructed in compliance with Code requirements and consistent with State Title 24 building standards that reduce energy demand. Upon site closure, all ancillary facilities and structures would be permanently removed and no longer generate energy demand.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed administrative building, two fee booths, and a 7,000 square-foot concrete maintenance building would be the only occupied structures on the site. These buildings, however, would be constructed in compliance with Code requirements and consistent with State Title 24 building standards that reduce energy demand. Upon site closure, all ancillary facilities and structures would be permanently removed and would no longer generate energy demand.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed administrative building, two fee booths, and a 7,000 square-foot concrete maintenance building would be the only occupied structures on the site. These buildings, however, would be constructed in compliance with Code requirements and consistent with State Title 24 building standards that reduce energy demand. Upon site closure, all ancillary facilities and structures would be permanently removed and would no longer generate energy demand.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed administrative building, two fee booths, and a 7,000 square-foot concrete maintenance building would be the only occupied structures on the site. These buildings, however, would be constructed in compliance with Code requirements and consistent with State Title 24 building standards that reduce energy demand. Upon site closure, all ancillary facilities and structures would be permanently removed and would no longer generate energy demand.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed administrative building, two fee booths, and a 7,000 square-foot concrete maintenance building would be the only occupied structures on the site. These buildings, however, would be constructed in compliance with Code requirements and consistent with State Title 24 building standards that reduce energy demand. Upon site closure, all ancillary facilities and structures would be permanently removed and would no longer generate energy demand.

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
GOAL COS-17 Sustainable Solid Waste Management. Perform solid waste management in a manner that protects natural resources from pollutants while providing sufficient, long term capacity through vigorous reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting programs.	<p><b>Consistent.</b> As described in the EIS, the alternative would comply with all State and federal regulations pertinent to the protection of water resources (i.e., San Luis Rey River and groundwater). Design features include the use of a double liner system and as well as a site-specific comprehensive SWPPP and monitoring program. The alternative's water quality plans also address the collection and disposal of leachate. Pollution control features include permanent stormwater drainage control features, including perimeter channels to capture runoff, sedimentation basins, and structural media filtration of surface runoff. The alternative would also incorporate litter control measures. The HRRMP includes a long-term management activity related to steelhead to ensure an unobstructed steam bed. The alternative would not replace or impede the County's waste reduction programs. See Sections 4.9, Hydrology, and 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS regarding specific pollutant control measures.</p> <p>Design features set forth in the EIS also address air quality and GHG emissions (health risk assessment, dust control, equipment manufacturing standards, etc.) and protection of biological resources (dedication of open space and HRRMP).</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would comply with all state and federal regulations pertinent to the protection of onsite blue water resources and groundwater. Measures include the use of a single composite liner system and as well as a site-specific comprehensive SWPPP with a monitoring program. Pollution control features include perimeter channels to capture runoff, sedimentation basins, and structural media filtration of surface runoff. The alternative would also incorporate litter control measures including the construction of a 12-foot high fence to capture wind-blown trash. The alternative would not replace or impede or replace the County's waste reduction programs. Design features and mitigation measures set forth in the EIS also address air quality and GHG emissions (health risk assessment, dust control, equipment manufacturing standards, etc.) and protection of biological resources(maintenance of areas of undeveloped open space). The alternative would also encourage recycling and resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would comply with all state and federal regulations pertinent to the protection of onsite blue water resources and groundwater. Measures include the use of a single composite liner system and as well as a site-specific comprehensive SWPPP with monitoring program. Pollution control features include perimeter channels to capture runoff, sedimentation basins, and structural media filtration of surface runoff. The alternative would also incorporate litter control measures including the construction of a 12-foot high fence to capture wind-blown trash. The alternative would not replace or impede or replace the County's waste reduction programs. Design features and mitigation measures set forth in the EIS also address air quality and GHG emissions (health risk assessment, dust control, equipment manufacturing standards, etc.) and protection of biological resources (maintenance of areas of undeveloped open space). The alternative would also encourage recycling and resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would comply with all state and federal regulations pertinent to the protection of onsite blue water resources and groundwater. Measures include the use of a single composite liner system and as well as a site-specific comprehensive SUSMP plans with monitoring program. Pollution control features include perimeter channels to capture runoff, sedimentation basins, and structural media filtration of surface runoff. The alternative would also incorporate litter control measures including the construction of a 12-foot high fence to capture wind-blown trash. The alternative would not replace or impede or replace the County's waste reduction programs. Design features and mitigation measures set forth in the EIS also address air quality and GHG emissions (health risk assessment, dust control, equipment manufacturing standards, etc.) and protection of biological resources(maintenance of areas of undeveloped open space). The alternative would also encourage recycling and resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would comply with all state and federal regulations pertinent to the protection of onsite blue water resources and groundwater. Measures include the use of a single composite liner system and as well as a site-specific comprehensive SUSMP plans with monitoring program. Pollution control features include perimeter channels to capture runoff, sedimentation basins, and structural media filtration of surface runoff. The alternative would also incorporate litter control measures including the construction of a 12-foot high fence to capture wind-blown trash. The alternative would not replace or impede or replace the County's waste reduction programs. Design features and mitigation measures set forth in the EIS also address air quality and GHG emissions (health risk assessment, dust control, equipment manufacturing standards, etc.) and protection of biological resources(maintenance of areas of undeveloped open space). The alternative would also encourage recycling and resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables.</p>
Policy COS-17.1 Reduction of Solid Waste Materials. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and future landfill capacity needs through reduction, reuse, or recycling of all types of solid waste that is generated. Divert solid waste from landfills in compliance with State law.	<p><b>Consistent.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the development of waste reduction programs. This alternative would not impede the County's efforts toward waste reduction and would allow for recycling and resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the development of waste reduction programs. This alternative would not impede the County's efforts toward waste reduction and would allow for recycling and resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the development of waste reduction programs. This alternative would not impede the County's efforts toward waste reduction and would allow for recycling and resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the development of waste reduction programs. This alternative would not impede the County's efforts toward waste reduction and would allow for recycling and resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the development of waste reduction programs. This alternative would not impede the County's efforts toward waste reduction and would allow for recycling and resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables.</p>

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy COS-17.3 Landfill Waste Management. Require landfills to use waste management and disposal techniques and practices to meet all applicable environmental standards.	<b>Consistent.</b> The EIS provides a detailed analysis of the manner in which this alternative would comply with all applicable federal, State, and local environmental standards related to the protection of resources (refer to the Chapter 4 of the EIS for a detailed discussion of the alternative's compliance with respective regulatory frameworks associated with each issue area).	<b>Consistent.</b> The EIS provides a detailed analysis of the manner in which this alternative would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local environmental standards related to the protection of resources (refer to the respective sections of the EIS for a detailed discussion of the alternative's compliance with respective regulatory frameworks associated with each issue area).	<b>Consistent.</b> The EIS provides a detailed analysis of the manner in which this alternative would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local environmental standards related to the protection of resources (refer to the respective sections of the EIS for a detailed discussion of the alternative's compliance with respective regulatory frameworks associated with each issue area).	<b>Consistent.</b> The EIS provides a detailed analysis of the manner in which this alternative would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local environmental standards related to the protection of resources (refer to the respective sections of the EIS for a detailed discussion of the alternative's compliance with respective regulatory frameworks associated with each issue area).	<b>Consistent.</b> The EIS provides a detailed analysis of the manner in which this alternative would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local environmental standards related to the protection of resources (refer to the respective sections of the EIS for a detailed discussion of the alternative's compliance with respective regulatory frameworks associated with each issue area).
Policy COS-17.5 Methane Recapture. Promote efficient methods for methane recapture in landfills and the use of composting facilities and anaerobic digesters and other sustainable strategies to reduce the release of GHG emissions from waste disposal or management sites and to generate additional energy such as electricity.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a gas control system to collect methane, carbon dioxide, and traces of other constituents that would occur as result of organic waste. The system includes gas extraction (collection wells), conveyance lines, and treatment (generally a landfill gas flare). Liquid condensate collected from the landfill gas system would be incinerated in the flares, treated on-site, and, if necessary, removed off-site for disposal.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a gas control system to collect methane, carbon dioxide, and traces of other constituents that would occur as result of organic waste. The system includes gas extraction (collection wells), conveyance lines, and treatment (generally a landfill gas flare). Liquid condensate collected from the landfill gas system would be incinerated in the flares, treated on-site, and, if necessary, removed off-site for disposal.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a gas control system to collect methane, carbon dioxide, and traces of other constituents that would occur as result of organic waste. The system includes gas extraction (collection wells), conveyance lines, and treatment (generally a landfill gas flare). Liquid condensate collected from the landfill gas system would be incinerated in the flares, treated on-site, and, if necessary, removed off-site for disposal.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a gas control system to collect methane, carbon dioxide, and traces of other constituents that would occur as result of organic waste. The system includes gas extraction (collection wells), conveyance lines, and treatment (generally a landfill gas flare). Liquid condensate collected from the landfill gas system would be incinerated in the flares, treated on-site, and, if necessary, removed off-site for disposal.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement a gas control system to collect methane, carbon dioxide, and traces of other constituents that would occur as result of organic waste. The system includes gas extraction (collection wells), conveyance lines, and treatment (generally a landfill gas flare). Liquid condensate collected from the landfill gas system would be incinerated in the flares, treated on-site, and, if necessary, removed off-site for disposal.
Policy COS-18.2 Energy Generation from Waste. Encourage use of methane sequestration and other sustainable strategies to produce energy and/or reduce GHG emissions from waste disposal or management sites.	<b>Consistent.</b> While not currently proposed as part of the alternative, the alternative would have the capability of providing methane to suppliers as a supplemental energy source.	<b>Consistent.</b> While not currently proposed as part of the alternative, the alternative would have the capability of providing methane to a public or private facility as a future supplemental energy source.	<b>Consistent.</b> While not currently proposed as part of the alternative, the alternative would have the capability of providing methane to a public or private facility as a future supplemental energy source.	<b>Consistent.</b> While not currently proposed as part of the alternative, the alternative would have the capability of providing methane to a public or private facility as a future supplemental energy source.	<b>Consistent.</b> While not currently proposed as part of the alternative, the alternative would have the capability of providing methane to a public or private facility as a future supplemental energy source.
GOAL COS-19 Sustainable Water Supply. Conservation of limited water supply supporting all uses including urban, rural, commercial, industrial, and agricultural uses.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement measures to reduce water demand, including the use of a soil sealant for dust control. On-site water supplies are expected to be adequate to meet water demand. However, as an alternate source, the applicant entered into an agreement with the San Gabriel Valley Water Company to obtain recycled water, which would meet any unexpected need. It is noted, however, that projected demand would be less than annual water use when the dairy farms were in operation.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement measures to reduce water demand, including the use of a soil sealant for dust control during operation. Municipal water would be available from the RMWD to meet demand during construction and operation. As a back-up only, any unexpected need for supplemental water could be obtained through recycled water from a private supplier.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement measures to reduce water demand, including the use of a soil sealant for dust control during operation. Municipal water would be available from the RMWD and, possibly, the Vallecitos Water District to meet demand during construction and operation. As a back-up only, any unexpected need for supplemental water could be obtained through recycled water from a private supplier.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement measures to reduce water demand, including the use of a soil sealant for dust control during operation. Municipal water would be available from the Vallecitos Water District to meet demand during construction and operation. As a back-up only, any unexpected need for supplemental water could be obtained through recycled water from a private supplier.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement measures to reduce water demand, including the use of a soil sealant for dust control during operation. Municipal water would be available from the Otay Water District to meet demand during construction and operation. As a back-up only, any unexpected need for supplemental water could be obtained through recycled water from a private supplier.

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
Policy COS-19.1 Sustainable Development Practices. Require land development, building design, landscaping, and operational practices that minimize water consumption.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement specific features to reduce water demand, including the use of a soil sealant. Native species, which are drought tolerant, would be replanted under the alternative's revegetation program and HRRMP.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement specific features to reduce water demand, including the use of soil sealants. Native species, which are drought tolerant, would be replanted under the alternative's revegetation program.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement specific features to reduce water demand, including the use of soil sealants. Native species, which are drought tolerant, would be replanted under the alternative's revegetation program.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement specific features to reduce water demand, including the use of soil sealants. Native species, which are drought tolerant, would be replanted under the alternative's revegetation program.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement specific features to reduce water demand, including the use of soil sealants. Native species, which are drought tolerant, would be replanted under the alternative's revegetation program.
Policy COS-19.2 Recycled Water in New Development. Require the use of recycled water in development wherever feasible. Restrict the use of recycled water when it increases salt loading in reservoirs.	<b>Consistent.</b> Water demand would be met through on-site well water. As an alternate source, the applicant would have the option to use up to 80,000 gpd of recycled water to supplement on-site water.	<b>Consistent.</b> Water demand would be met through municipal services provided by the RMWD. As a backup supply only, the applicant would have the option to use recycled water, if available.	<b>Consistent.</b> Water demand would be met through municipal services provided by the RMWD and Vallecitos Water District. As a backup supply only, the applicant would have the option to use recycled water, if available.	<b>Consistent.</b> Water demand would be met through municipal services provided by the Vallecitos Water District. As a backup supply only, the applicant would have the option to use recycled water, if available.	<b>Consistent.</b> Water demand would be met through municipal services provided by the Otay Water District. As a backup supply only, the applicant would have the option to use recycled water, if available.
CHPATER 6 HOUSING ELEMENT					
Goals H-1 through H-6, and respective policies, pertain to housing development, neighborhood character, housing affordability, preservation of affordable housing, governmental constraints on housing, and delivery of housing services.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not affect the County's ability to meet Housing Element goals and would not interfere with any of the County's housing implementation programs. The site is Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility) and the use of the site would not preclude the County from meeting its housing goals.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The property is zoned designated as Rural Lands (RL20), Rural Lands (RL-40) and Semi-Rural Lands (SR-2), which allows residential development. With the development of the landfill, the land would not be available at any time in the future for residential use. As such, the alternative could preclude the County from meeting its housing goals.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The site is generally undeveloped with a few existing residences located on the western portion of the site. The Panoramic Estates, a gated residential subdivision with 35 lots (four acres plus in size), has been approved on the remainder of the site. Infrastructure, including roads (Panoramic Drive, Panoramic Way, and Panoramic Place), sidewalks, and curbs have been completed for the subdivision. Construction of a landfill would preclude development of the residential lots and require removal of the roads and limited improvements on the site. As such, the alternative could preclude the County from meeting its housing goals.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is located in the middle of the Merriam Mountain range and is zoned as Rural Land (RL-20). Although the zoning would permit low density residential development, the topography of the property indicates that the property would likely remain open space. Vacant lands surrounding the property may, in fact, be more suitable for residential uses. Because the property has a low suitability for residential development, the location of a landfill in this area is not expected to preclude the County from meeting its housing goals.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not affect the County's ability to meet Housing Element goals and would not interfere with any of the County's housing implementation programs. The site is Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility) and the use of the site would not preclude the County from meeting its housing goals.
CHPATER 7 SAFETY ELEMENT					
GOAL S-1 Public Safety. Enhanced public safety and the protection of public and private property.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate features to ensure public safety and protection of public and private property (see Section 4.8, Human Health and Safety, of the EIS). In addition, a Hazardous Waste Exclusion Program (HWEP) would be incorporated into this alternative to address the potential of hazardous waste or other unacceptable wastes being brought to the site. Example design features to ensure public safety include daily compaction and application of daily	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate design features and mitigation measures to ensure public safety and protection of public and private property (see Section 4.8, Human Health and Safety, of the EIS). The landfill would not be used for the disposal of hazardous materials. In addition, a Hazardous Waste Exclusion Program (HWEP) would be incorporated into this alternative to address the potential of hazardous waste or other unacceptable wastes	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate design features and mitigation measures to ensure public safety and protection of public and private property (see Section 4.8, Human Health and Safety, of the EIS). The landfill would not be used for the disposal of hazardous materials. In addition, a Hazardous Waste Exclusion Program (HWEP) would be incorporated into this alternative to address the potential of hazardous	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate design features and mitigation measures to ensure public safety and protection of public and private property (see Section 4.8, Human Health and Safety, of the EIS). The landfill would not be used for the disposal of hazardous materials. In addition, a Hazardous Waste Exclusion Program (HWEP) would be incorporated into this alternative to address the potential of hazardous waste or other unacceptable wastes	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate design features and mitigation measures to ensure public safety and protection of public and private property (see Section 4.8, Human Health and Safety, of the EIS). The landfill would not be used for the disposal of hazardous materials. In addition, a Hazardous Waste Exclusion Program (HWEP) would be incorporated into this alternative to address the potential of hazardous waste or other unacceptable wastes

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
	cover; storage in closed containers of materials that attract vector; repairs of building openings, ground holes and deficiencies in perimeter fencing would be performed to deter intrusion of ground vectors; proper grading/drainage to eliminate puddles and wet areas; regular drainage and cleaning of desilting basins; a minimum of twice yearly tire shredding; litter pick-up adjacent to the access road and SR 76 between I-15 and this site; and dust control measures.	being brought to the site. Dust control measures would be implemented to reduce impacts from dust (see Section, 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases of the EIS).	waste or other unacceptable wastes being brought to the site. Dust control measures would be implemented to reduce impacts from dust (see Section, 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases of the EIS).	being brought to the site. Dust control measures would be implemented to reduce impacts from dust (see Section, 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases of the EIS).	being brought to the site. Dust control measures would be implemented to reduce impacts from dust (see Section, 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases of the EIS).
Policy S-1.1 Minimize Exposure to Hazards. Minimize the population exposed to hazards by assigning land use designations and density allowances that reflect site specific constraints and hazards.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be consistent with the Public/Semi-Public Lands (Solid Waste Facility) designation for the site and surrounded by low density residential uses, open space, industrial uses, and agricultural operations. The location of the alternative in the low density area is consistent with the policy to minimize population exposed to a land use, such as the alternative, that requires site-specific constraints.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be located within an area of low density housing and large areas of open space. The location of the alternative in the low density area is consistent with the policy to minimize population exposed to a land use, such as the alternative, that requires site-specific constraints.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be located within an area of low density housing and large areas of open space. The location of the alternative in the low density area is consistent with the policy to minimize population exposed to a land use, such as the alternative, that requires site-specific constraints.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be located within an area of low density housing and large areas of open space. The location of the alternative in the low density area is consistent with the policy to minimize population exposed to a land use, such as the alternative, that requires site-specific constraints.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be consistent with the Public/Semi-Public Lands (Solid Waste Facility) designation for the site and surrounded by low density residential uses, open space, industrial uses, and agricultural operations. The location of the alternative in the low density area is consistent with the policy to minimize population exposed to a land use, such as the alternative, that requires site-specific constraints.
Policy S-1.2 Public Facilities Location. Advise, and where appropriate require, new development to locate future public facilities, including new essential and sensitive facilities, with respect to the County's hazardous areas and State law.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be consistent with the site's Public/Semi-Public Lands (Solid Waste Facility) designation and would be required to comply with all applicable Federal, State and local rules and regulations for the design, construction and operation of municipal solid waste landfills.	<b>Consistent.</b> The location of the alternative in a low density area and compliance of the alternative with applicable federal, state and local rules and regulations would be consistent with the policy to locate public facilities in an area where all applicable rules and regulations for the design, construction and operation of municipal solid waste landfills can be implemented.	<b>Consistent.</b> The location of the alternative in a low density area and compliance of the alternative with applicable federal, state and local rules and regulations would be consistent with the policy to locate public facilities in an area where all applicable rules and regulations for the design, construction and operation of municipal solid waste landfills can be implemented.	<b>Consistent.</b> The location of the alternative in a low density area and compliance of the alternative with applicable federal, state and local rules and regulations would be consistent with the policy to locate public facilities in an area where all applicable rules and regulations for the design, construction and operation of municipal solid waste landfills can be implemented.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be consistent with the site's Public/Semi-Public Lands (Solid Waste Facility) designation and would be required to comply with all applicable Federal, State and local rules and regulations for the design, construction and operation of municipal solid waste landfills.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy S-1.3 Risk Reduction Programs. Support efforts and programs that reduce the risk of natural and manmade hazards and that reduce the time for responding to these hazards.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate a broad range of safety features to minimize hazards related to chemical or hazardous waste, infestation, litter, fire and other hazards. Design features include the implementation of a Hazardous Waste Exclusion Program (HWEPP), load inspection, application of daily cover, rodent control, litter control, covered commercial vehicles, monitoring of water quality, dust control, cleaning of desilting basins, 150-foot fire break around the perimeter of the landfill footprint and other waste and fire-related measures (see Sections 4.8, Human Health and Safety and 4.12.2, Fire Protection, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate a broad range of safety features to minimize hazards related to chemical or hazardous waste, infestation, litter, fire and other hazards. Design features include the refusal of all hazardous waste materials, implementation of a Hazardous Waste Exclusion Program (HWEPP) to aid the discovery of hazardous materials, load inspection, application of daily cover, rodent control, litter control, covered commercial vehicles, water quality control, dust control, cleaning of desilting basins, 150-foot fire break around the perimeter of the landfill footprint and other waste and fire-related measures (see Sections 4.8, Human Health and Safety and 4.12.2, Fire Protection, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate a broad range of safety features to minimize hazards related to chemical or hazardous waste, infestation, litter, fire and other hazards. Design features include the refusal of all hazardous waste materials, implementation of a Hazardous Waste Exclusion Program (HWEPP) to aid the discovery of hazardous materials, load inspection, application of daily cover, rodent control, litter control, covered commercial vehicles, water quality control, dust control, cleaning of desilting basins, 150-foot fire break around the perimeter of the landfill footprint and other waste and fire-related measures (see Sections 4.8, Human Health and Safety and 4.12.2, Fire Protection, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate a broad range of safety features to minimize hazards related to chemical or hazardous waste, infestation, litter, fire and other hazards. Design features include the refusal of all hazardous waste materials, implementation of a Hazardous Waste Exclusion Program (HWEPP) to aid the discovery of hazardous materials, load inspection, application of daily cover, rodent control, litter control, covered commercial vehicles, water quality control, dust control, cleaning of desilting basins, 150-foot fire break around the perimeter of the landfill footprint and other waste and fire-related measures (see Sections 4.8, Human Health and Safety and 4.12.2, Fire Protection, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate a broad range of safety features to minimize hazards related to chemical or hazardous waste, infestation, litter, fire and other hazards. Design features include the refusal of all hazardous waste materials, implementation of a Hazardous Waste Exclusion Program (HWEPP) to aid the discovery of hazardous materials, load inspection, application of daily cover, rodent control, litter control, covered commercial vehicles, water quality control, dust control, cleaning of desilting basins, 150-foot fire break around the perimeter of the landfill footprint and other waste and fire-related measures (see Sections 4.8, Human Health and Safety and 4.12.2, Fire Protection, of the EIS).
GOAL S-3 Minimize Fire Hazards. Minimize injury, loss of life, and damage to property resulting from structural or wildland fire hazards.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be located within a wildland fire area. Design features incorporated into alternative would minimize fire hazards. Fire safety measures summarized under Policy COS-14.1, above, and in discussed in detail in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection, of the EIS, would be implemented.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be located within a wildland fire area. Design features incorporated into alternative would minimize fire hazards. Design features and mitigation measures identical to those implemented for the Applicant's Proposed Alternative and described in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection, of the EIS, would be implemented.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be located within a wildland fire area. Design features incorporated into alternative would minimize fire hazards. Design features and mitigation measures identical to those implemented for the Applicant's Proposed Alternative and described in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection, of the EIS, would be implemented.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be located within a wildland fire area. Design features incorporated into alternative would minimize fire hazards. Design features and mitigation measures identical to those implemented for the Applicant's Proposed Alternative and described in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection, of the EIS, would be implemented.	<b>Consistent.</b> A wildland fire area is located immediately to the north of the site; however, the site is not located within a wildland fire area. Nevertheless, design features incorporated into alternative would minimize fire hazards. Design features and mitigation measures identical to those implemented for the Applicant's Proposed Alternative and described in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection, of the EIS, would be implemented.
Policy S-3.1 Defensible Development. Require development to be located, designed, and constructed to provide adequate defensibility and minimize the risk of structural loss and life safety resulting from wildland fires.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is located adjacent to a SR 76, which would provide direct access to fire suppression equipment. Also, as discussed above, design features regarding fire protection would be incorporated into this alternative. In the event of an above-surface fire at the landfill, dozers would be used to cover exposed fires, and scrapers would transport soil to the fire area. As a back-up, on-site water trucks would be dispatched to the fire area to begin fire control. Additional measures also include the clearance of brush and vegetative debris from around the active disposal area.	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill site would be accessed via a 2.25-mile road with secondary access. As with the Applicant's Proposed Alternatives, point and steep gradient would decrease the defensibility of the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The location of the site at the end of a 0.5-mile road with only one access point would decrease defensibility. However, access to Gopher Canyon Road, an arterial with access to I-15, and points west, would respectively reduce the fire hazard associated with defensibility.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would be located in steep terrain, and location of the site in proximity to I-15 would provide for the defensibility of the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although the site would be located at the end of a 1.0-mile road with one access point, the ease of access and visibility of the site would provide for the defensibility of the site.



**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy S-3.2 Development in Hillsides and Canyons. Require development located near ridgelines, top of slopes, saddles, or other areas where the terrain or topography affect its susceptibility to wildfires to be located and designed to account for topography and reduce the increased risk from fires.	<b>Consistent.</b> Ancillary facilities and other structures would be located with access to SR 76. A secondary access would be available to the south of the property. The area in which these facilities are located is near the river and former Lucio dairy site and not within steep terrain. The potential for wildland fires would be reduced through the alternative's fire prevention and control measures including the use of a firebreak between the refuse and the undisturbed natural areas surrounding the landfill in accordance with the California Public Resources Code Section 4373 and other measures listed in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection of the EIS.	<b>Consistent.</b> Ancillary facilities and other structures would be located in a hilly area and would be located approximately 2.25 miles from the nearest public road (intersection of Rainbow Glen Road and Oak Crest Road). However, facilities would be designed to account for topography and would include a water tank with fire suppression capability, the use of a 150-foot firebreak between the refuse and the undisturbed natural areas surrounding the landfill in accordance with the California Public Resources Code Section 4373, and other measures listed in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection of the EIS. Because the facilities would be designed to account of the topography of the site, the alternative would be consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> Ancillary facilities and other structures would be located in a hilly area and would be located approximately 0.5 mile from the nearest public road. However, facilities would be designed to account for topography and include would include a water tank with fire suppression capability, the use of a 150-foot firebreak between the refuse and the undisturbed natural areas surrounding the landfill in accordance with the California Public Resources Code Section 4373, and other measures listed in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection of the EIS. Because the facilities would be designed to account of the topography of the site, the alternative would be consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> Ancillary facilities and other structures would be located in a hilly area and would be located approximately 0.5 mile from the nearest public road. However, facilities would be designed to account for topography and include would include a water tank with fire suppression capability, the use of a 150-foot firebreak between the refuse and the undisturbed natural areas surrounding the landfill in accordance with the California Public Resources Code Section 4373, and other measures listed in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection of the EIS. Because the facilities would be designed to account of the topography of the site, the alternative would be consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> Ancillary facilities and other structures would be located in a hilly area and would be located approximately 1.0 mile from the nearest public road. However, facilities would be designed to account for topography and include would include a water tank with fire suppression capability, the use of a 150-foot firebreak between the refuse and the undisturbed natural areas surrounding the landfill in accordance with the California Public Resources Code Section 4373, and other measures listed in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection of the EIS. Because the facilities would be designed to account of the topography of the site, the alternative would be consistent with this policy.
Policy S-3.3 Minimize Flammable Vegetation. Site and design development to minimize the likelihood of a wildfire spreading to structures by minimizing pockets or peninsulas, or islands of flammable vegetation within a development.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate a firebreak of 150 foot minimum clearance around the perimeter of the landfill footprint, except where soil cover is placed regularly throughout the day in compliance with California Public Resources Code Section 4373. Fire clearance would also be provided around the perimeter of ancillary facilities, in accordance with exiting Code requirements.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate a firebreak of 150 foot minimum clearance around the perimeter of the landfill footprint, except where soil cover is placed regularly throughout the day in compliance with California Public Resources Code Section 4373. Fire clearance would also be provided around the perimeter of ancillary facilities, in accordance with exiting Code requirements.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate a firebreak of 150 foot minimum clearance around the perimeter of the landfill footprint, except where soil cover is placed regularly throughout the day in compliance with California Public Resources Code Section 4373. Fire clearance would also be provided around the perimeter of ancillary facilities, in accordance with exiting Code requirements.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate a firebreak of 150 foot minimum clearance around the perimeter of the landfill footprint, except where soil cover is placed regularly throughout the day in compliance with California Public Resources Code Section 4373. Fire clearance would also be provided around the perimeter of ancillary facilities, in accordance with exiting Code requirements.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate a firebreak of 150 foot minimum clearance around the perimeter of the landfill footprint, except where soil cover is placed regularly throughout the day in compliance with California Public Resources Code Section 4373. Fire clearance would also be provided around the perimeter of ancillary facilities, in accordance with exiting Code requirements.
Policy S-3.5 Access Roads. Require development to provide additional access roads when necessary to provide for safe access of emergency equipment and civilian evacuation concurrently.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is located on SR 76, a major highway that would provide direct access to the east and west for evacuation and emergency equipment. Non-public, emergency access would also be possible from private property to the south of the Gregory Canyon site (existing avocado groves). The grove area outlets to Couser Canyon Road, which has north/south access.	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill site would be located in a canyon area at the end of an approximately 2.25-mile road. Secondary access would be provided to ensure compliance with Fire Code regulations.	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill site would be located in a canyon area at the end of an approximately 0.50-mile road. Because of road gradient and location in the canyon, secondary access would be provided to ensure compliance with Fire Code regulations.	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill site would be located in a canyon area at the end of an approximately 0.50-mile road. Because of road gradient and location in the canyon, secondary access would be provided to ensure compliance with Fire Code regulations.	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill site would be located in a canyon area at the end of an approximately 1.0-mile single road. Determination would be made by the County Fire Department regarding the compliance of the single access with Fire Code regulations.
Policy S-3.6 Fire Protection Measures. Ensure that development located within fire threat areas implement measures that reduce the risk of structural and human loss due to wildfire.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate fire protection measures as described under Goal S-3, above and in Section 4.12.2, Fire Protection and Medical Emergency Services, of the EIS.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate fire protection measures, as under the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, described under Goal S-3, above.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate fire protection measures, as under the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, described under Goal S-3, above.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate fire protection measures, as under the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, described under Goal S-3, above.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate fire protection measures, as under the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, described under Goal S-3, above.



**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy S-3.7 Fire Resistant Construction. Require all new, remodeled, or rebuilt structures to meet current ignition resistance construction codes and establish and enforce reasonable and prudent standards that support retrofitting of existing structures in high fire threat areas.	<b>Consistent.</b> All habitable structures would comply with current construction standards, including all fire resistant provisions.	<b>Consistent.</b> All habitable structures would comply with current construction standards, including all fire resistant provisions.	<b>Consistent.</b> All habitable structures would comply with current construction standards, including all fire resistant provisions.	<b>Consistent.</b> All habitable structures would comply with current construction standards, including all fire resistant provisions.	<b>Consistent.</b> All habitable structures would comply with current construction standards, including all fire resistant provisions.
GOAL S-6 and Policies S-6.1 through S-6.3 apply to adequate fire and emergency medical services (EMS) in the unincorporated County, water supply for fire suppression; fire protection for multi-story development, funding fire protection services.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal and respective policies apply to the County's responsibilities in the provision of fire and EMS infrastructure, which is not the objective of the alternative. However, the alternative would support the County's fire and EMS through the provision of on-site fire suppression capability and trained personnel. As summarized under Policy COS-14.11, and described in detail in Section 4.12.2, Fire Safety, of the EIS, fire safety measures would be implemented. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board has adopted comprehensive regulations (Subchapter 15) for landfill design and construction which include requirements for monitoring and control of methane gas releases.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal and respective policies apply to the County's responsibilities in the provision of fire and EMS infrastructure, which is not the objective of the alternative. However, the alternative would support the County's fire and EMS through the provision of on-site fire suppression capability and trained personnel. As summarized under Policy COS-14.11, and described in detail in Section 4.12.2, Fire Safety, of the EIS, fire safety measures would be implemented. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board has adopted comprehensive regulations (Subchapter 15) for landfill design and construction which include requirements for monitoring and control of methane gas releases.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal and respective policies apply to the County's responsibilities in the provision of fire and EMS infrastructure, which is not the objective of the alternative. However, the alternative would support the County's fire and EMS through the provision of on-site fire suppression capability and trained personnel. As summarized under Policy COS-14.11, and described in detail in Section 4.12.2, Fire Safety, of the EIS, fire safety measures would be implemented. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board has adopted comprehensive regulations (Subchapter 15) for landfill design and construction which include requirements for monitoring and control of methane gas releases.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal and respective policies apply to the County's responsibilities in the provision of fire and EMS infrastructure, which is not the objective of the alternative. However, the alternative would support the County's fire and EMS through the provision of on-site fire suppression capability and trained personnel. As summarized under Policy COS-14.11, and described in detail in Section 4.12.2, Fire Safety, of the EIS, fire safety measures would be implemented. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board has adopted comprehensive regulations (Subchapter 15) for landfill design and construction which include requirements for monitoring and control of methane gas releases.	<b>Consistent.</b> This goal and respective policies apply to the County's responsibilities in the provision of fire and EMS infrastructure, which is not the objective of the alternative. However, the alternative would support the County's fire and EMS through the provision of on-site fire suppression capability and trained personnel. As summarized under Policy COS-14.11, and described in detail in Section 4.12.2, Fire Safety, of the EIS, fire safety measures would be implemented. In addition, the State Water Resources Control Board has adopted comprehensive regulations (Subchapter 15) for landfill design and construction which include requirements for monitoring and control of methane gas releases.
Policy S-6.4 Fire Protection Services for Development. Require that new development demonstrate that fire services can be provided that meets the minimum travel times identified in Table S-1 (Travel Time Standards from Closest Fire Station). (According to Table S-1, travel time standards for all commercial and industrial designations in rural lands (SR -4 and SR-10 - Regional Category) would be 20 minutes.)	<b>Consistent.</b> Fire protection services are expected to be provided by the San Diego County Fire Authority. Current service to this area is through an Amador contract with CAL FIRE. Current services in the area through the Amador agreement are provided by the Miller Station at 9127 West Lilac Road and the Rincon Station at 16971 Highway 76. The Miller Station is 6.6 miles from the site with a travel time of approximately 11.85 minutes. The Rincon Station is 12.3 miles from the site with a travel time of approximately 21.6 minutes. The proximity of the property to the Miller Station indicates an acceptable travel time standard to the property.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Aspen Road site is located within the boundaries of the North County Fire Protection District. The first in Station is Station Number #4, located at 4375 Pala Mesa Drive. The district's estimated travel time to the alternative site from Station #4, is 15 minutes. Station #4 is equipped with a medic engine, a brush truck and a medic ambulance. The District is negotiating with developers to possibly build a new Station #4 at its current site. The District is made up of 2 Divisions - Fallbrook and Rainbow. The travel time standard would be well below the minimum standard described in Table S-1 for a rural site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The property is served by the Deer Springs Fire Protection District and Vista Fire Protection District. The average response time in the Deer Springs District is 8.32 minutes, and the average response time for the Vista Fire Department is 4:49 minutes. The travel time standard would be well below the minimum standard described in Table S-1 for a rural site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The property is served by the Deer Springs Fire Protection District, which has an average response time of 8.32 minutes. This response time well below the minimum standard described in Table S-1 for a rural site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The property is served by the San Diego Rural Fire Protection District, which has an average response time of five minutes. This response time well below the minimum standard described in Table S-1 for a rural site.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
GOAL S-7 Reduced Seismic Hazards. Minimized personal injury and property damage resulting from seismic hazards.	<b>Consistent.</b> No known active faults exist in the general site area; and the site does not lie within an Alquist Priolo Zone. The nearest active fault to the site is the Elsinore fault zone, located approximately 6 miles northeast of the site. However, because the area is seismically active, design features incorporated into the alternative would reduce seismic hazard. These include liner buttressing, site inspections, site monitoring, inspection of rock masses, and design for maximum probable earthquake. With the incorporation of these features and implementation of all regulatory requirements, the alternative would be consistent with this goal (refer to Section 4.7, Geology and Soils, in the EIS for a full discussion regarding seismic hazards).	<b>Consistent.</b> No known active faults exist in the general site area; and the site does not lie within an Alquist Priolo Zone. The nearest active fault to the site is the Elsinore fault zone, located approximately 4.3 miles northeast of the site. Design features to reduce seismic risk would be similar to those incorporated into the Applicant's Proposed Alternative. With the incorporation of these design features and implementation of all regulatory requirements, the alternative would be consistent with this goal.	<b>Consistent.</b> No known active faults exist in the general site area; and the site does not lie within an Alquist Priolo Zone. The nearest active fault to the site is the Elsinore fault zone, located approximately 12.8 miles northeast of the site. Design features to reduce seismic risk would be similar to those incorporated into the Applicant's Proposed Alternative. With the incorporation of these design features and implementation of all regulatory requirements, the alternative would be consistent with this goal.	<b>Consistent.</b> Six well-defined lineaments border the site that may indicate fault structure, but no evidence of faulting is known in the area; nor known active, potentially active, or inactive faults that transect the site. The site does not lie within an Alquist Priolo Zone. The nearest active fault to the site is the Elsinore fault zone, located approximately 12 miles northeast of the site. Design features to reduce seismic risk would be similar to those incorporated into the Applicant's Proposed Alternative. With the incorporation of these design features and implementation of all regulatory requirements, the alternative would be consistent with this goal.	<b>Consistent.</b> No evidence of faulting is known in the area; nor known active, potentially active, or inactive faults that transect the site. The site does not lie within an Alquist Priolo Zone. The nearest active fault to the site is the Elsinore fault zone, located approximately 12 miles northeast of the site. Design features to reduce seismic risk would be similar to those incorporated into the Applicant's Proposed Alternative. With the incorporation of these design features and implementation of all regulatory requirements, the alternative would be consistent with this goal.
Policy S-7.1 Development Location. Locate development in areas where the risk to people or resources is minimized. In accordance with the California Department of Conservation Special Publication 42, require development be located a minimum of 50 feet from active or potentially active faults, unless an alternative setback distance is approved based on geologic analysis and feasible engineering design measures adequate to demonstrate that the fault rupture hazard would be avoided.	<b>Consistent.</b> No active faults occurring or crossing through any portion of this site have been in identified in any past studies or discovered during a geologic inspection of this site. Because this site does not contain active fault traces, including bedrock faulting, geologic hazard resulting from fault rupture hazard would be avoided.	<b>Consistent.</b> No active faults occurring or crossing through any portion of this site have been in identified in any past studies or discovered during a geologic inspection of this site. Because this site does not contain active fault traces, geologic hazard resulting from fault rupture hazard would be avoided.	<b>Consistent.</b> No active faults occurring or crossing through any portion of this site have been in identified in any past studies or discovered during a geologic inspection of this site. Because this site does not contain active fault traces, geologic hazard resulting from fault rupture hazard would be avoided.	<b>Consistent.</b> No active faults occurring or crossing through any portion of this site have been in identified in any past studies or discovered during a geologic inspection of this site. Because this site does not contain active fault traces, geologic hazard resulting from fault rupture hazard would be avoided.	<b>Consistent.</b> No active faults occurring or crossing through any portion of this site have been in identified in any past studies or discovered during a geologic inspection of this site. Because this site does not contain active fault traces, geologic hazard resulting from fault rupture hazard would be avoided.
Policy S-7.2 Engineering Measures to Reduce Risk. Require all development to include engineering measures to reduce risk in accordance with the California Building Code, Uniform Building Code, and other seismic and geologic hazard safety standards, including design and construction standards that regulate land use in areas known to have or potentially have significant seismic and/or other geologic hazards.	<b>Consistent.</b> All geologic hazards would be addressed through engineered solutions in compliance with the California Building Code, Uniform Building Code and other geologic safety standards, including design and construction standards. The alternative would comply with CCR Title including: 2H:1V (horizontal:vertical) excavation slope inclinations; 3H:1V maximum landfill fill slope inclinations; a 2 percent minimum landfill base liner system grade; and a 3 percent minimum landfill final cover grade. Other standard landfill components include maintenance of natural vegetation, inspection of all facilities after seismic events, a monitoring and maintenance program	<b>Consistent.</b> Uniform Building Code and other geologic safety standards, including design and construction standards. The alternative would comply with CCR Title 27and standard features for Southern California landfills, including: 2H:1V (horizontal:vertical) excavation slope inclinations; 3H:1V maximum landfill fill slope inclinations; a 2 percent minimum landfill base liner system grade; and a 3 percent minimum landfill final cover grade. Other standard landfill components include maintenance of natural vegetation, inspection of all facilities after seismic events, a monitoring and maintenance program for the final cover and gas	<b>Consistent.</b> Uniform Building Code and other geologic safety standards, including design and construction standards. The alternative would comply with CCR Title 27, including: 2H:1V (horizontal:vertical) excavation slope inclinations; 3H:1V maximum landfill fill slope inclinations; a 2 percent minimum landfill base liner system grade; and a 3 percent minimum landfill final cover grade. Other standard landfill components include maintenance of natural vegetation, inspection of all facilities after seismic events, a monitoring and maintenance program for the final cover and gas control systems, and design of all	<b>Consistent.</b> Uniform Building Code and other geologic safety standards, including design and construction standards. The alternative would comply with CCR Title 27, including: 2H:1V (horizontal:vertical) excavation slope inclinations; 3H:1V maximum landfill fill slope inclinations; a 2 percent minimum landfill base liner system grade; and a 3 percent minimum landfill final cover grade. Further, the alternative would have other standard landfill components, similar to those described for the landfill at the Gregory Canyon site above. These include maintenance of natural vegetation, inspection of all facilities after seismic events, a	<b>Consistent.</b> Uniform Building Code and other geologic safety standards, including design and construction standards. The alternative would comply with CCR Title 27and standard features for Southern California landfills, including: 2H:1V (horizontal:vertical) excavation slope inclinations; 3H:1V maximum landfill fill slope inclinations; a 2 percent minimum landfill base liner system grade; and a 3 percent minimum landfill final cover grade. Other standard landfill components include maintenance of natural vegetation, inspection of all facilities after seismic events, a monitoring and maintenance program for the final cover and gas

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
	for the final cover and gas control systems, and design of all landfill structures by a qualified engineer to withstand the maximum probable earthquake. Protection would be provided for the aqueduct pipelines that pass through the site (e.g. the use of reinforced slabs placed over the easement). Rockfall and debris flow would be addressed through the use of pre-blast surveys, inspection of rock masses, and use of catchment/diversion structures.	control systems, and design of all landfill structures by a qualified engineer to withstand the maximum probable earthquake. Protection would be provided for the aqueduct pipelines that pass through the site (e.g. the use of reinforced slabs placed over the easement). Rockfall and debris flow is not anticipated.	landfill structures by a qualified engineer to withstand the maximum probable earthquake. Rockfall and debris flow of the type anticipated at the Gregory Canyon site might be expected. Such potential impacts would be evaluated during site specific studies during preparation of the JTD. Similar and/or equivalent measures to those recommend for the Gregory Canyon site would be incorporated into the design (e.g. use of pre-blast surveys, inspection of rock masses, and use of catchment/diversion structures, as needed.	monitoring and maintenance program for the final cover and gas control systems, and design of all landfill structures by a qualified engineer to withstand the maximum probable earthquake. Potential impacts associated with rockfall and debris flow would be evaluated during site specific studies during preparation of the JTD; and similar and/or equivalent design features to those recommend for the Gregory Canyon site would be incorporated into the design (e.g. use of pre-blast surveys, inspection of rock masses, and use of catchment/diversion structures) if needed.	control systems, and design of all landfill structures by a qualified engineer to withstand the maximum probable earthquake. Protection would be provided for the aqueduct pipelines that pass through the site (e.g. the use of reinforced slabs placed over the easement). Rockfall and debris flow is not anticipated.
Policy S-7.3 Land Use Location. Prohibit high occupancy uses, essential public facilities, and uses that permit significant amounts of hazardous materials within Alquist-Priolo and County special studies zones.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo or County special study zone.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo or County special study zone.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo or County special study zone.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo or County special study zone.	<b>Consistent.</b> The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo or County special study zone.
GOAL S-8 Reduced Landslide, Mudslide, and Rock Fall Hazards. Minimize personal injury and property damage caused by mudslides, landslides, or rock falls.	<b>Consistent.</b> State regulations require that the site activities be performed in a manner that provides a safety factor of 1.5 and/or meet other design specifications that are sufficient to maintain the integrity of the site. Mapping and evaluation, with protective responses as appropriate, during excavation/cut activities would identify any potential danger from localized rock falls due to fractures. Engineered borrow/stockpile slopes would exceed minimum static CCR static factor of safety for the critical failure plane of 1.50. The calculated displacement of the total refuse prism and liner in a maximum ground acceleration would be less than the commonly accepted maximum displacements for liner systems of 6 inches to 12 inches. Calculated displacement of the final cover indicates a displacement ranging from 1.7 to 5.1 inches, also exceeding commonly accepted displacement.  Relocation of First San Diego Aqueduct pipeline and SDG&E towers would be designed to comply with all applicable	<b>Consistent.</b> As with the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, the Aspen Road Alternative would be constructed and monitored in compliance with existing regulations and standard and would be consistent with this goal.	<b>Consistent.</b> As with the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, the Gopher Canyon Road Alternative would be constructed and monitored in compliance with existing regulations and standard and would be consistent with this goal.	<b>Consistent.</b> As with the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, the Merriam Mountain Alternative would be constructed and monitored in compliance with existing regulations and standard and would be consistent with this goal.	<b>Consistent.</b> As with the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, the East Otay Mesa Alternative would be constructed and monitored in compliance with existing regulations and standard and would be consistent with this goal.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
	standards. Because the stability of cut and fill slopes would meet or exceed regulatory standards, the alternative would be consistent with this policy.				
Policy S-8.1 Landslide Risks. Direct development away from areas with high landslide, mudslide, or rock fall potential when engineering solutions have been determined by the County to be infeasible.	<b>Consistent.</b> A rockfall analysis indicated that a bouncing rock fragment under a worst case scenario might encroach 300 feet into the fill area, with a travel time from the top of the profile of 22 seconds; and rolling rock fragments could travel as much as 360 feet onto the landfill if unchecked. Design features are incorporated to protect workers from harm. These features include inspection of large boulders prior to development of an area of the landfill; identification of rockfall potential prior to blasting; observation of potential rockfalls during operations through the use of a spotter; use of catchment walls, and inspection of the rock masses surrounding the landfill every 5 years and/or after a significant earthquake event. In the event a loose boulder were identified, controlled displacement of the boulder(s) where possible would occur and/or placement of catching walls to stop a potential rockfall. With the implementation of these features, which are consistent with regulatory measures, the alternative would be consistent with this policy.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Aspen Road site does not pose the same potential for rockfall as does the Gregory Canyon site, or unusual site conditions regarding rockfall that could not be addressed through standard landfill design procedures. However, design procedures such as the following could be included as needed: inspection of large boulders prior to development of an area of the landfill, identification of rockfall potential prior to blasting, observation of potential rockfalls during operations through the use of a spotter; and inspection of the rock masses surrounding the landfill every 5 years and/or after a significant earthquake event; with controlled displacement of potentially insecure boulders where possible and/or placement of catching walls to stop rockfall.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Gopher Canyon Road site does not pose the same potential for rockfall as does the Gregory Canyon site, or unusual site conditions regarding rockfall that could not be addressed through standard landfill design procedures. However, design procedures such as the following could be included as needed: inspection of large boulders prior to development of an area of the landfill, identification of rockfall potential prior to blasting, observation of potential rockfalls during operations through the use of a spotter; and inspection of the rock masses surrounding the landfill every 5 years and/or after a significant earthquake event; with controlled displacement of potentially insecure boulders where possible and/or placement of catching walls to stop rockfall.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Merriam Mountain site does not pose the same potential for rockfall as does the Gregory Canyon site, or unusual site conditions regarding rockfall that could not be addressed through standard landfill design procedures. However, design procedures such as the following could be included as needed: inspection of large boulders prior to development of an area of the landfill, identification of rockfall potential prior to blasting, observation of potential rockfalls during operations through the use of a spotter; and inspection of the rock masses surrounding the landfill every 5 years and/or after a significant earthquake event; with controlled displacement of potentially insecure boulders where possible and/or placement of catching walls to stop rockfall.	<b>Consistent.</b> The East Otay Mesa site does not pose the same potential for rockfall as does the Gregory Canyon site, or unusual site conditions regarding rockfall that could not be addressed through standard landfill design procedures. However, design procedures such as the following could be included as needed: inspection of large boulders prior to development of an area of the landfill, identification of rockfall potential prior to blasting, observation of potential rockfalls during operations through the use of a spotter; and inspection of the rock masses surrounding the landfill every 5 years and/or after a significant earthquake event; with controlled displacement of potentially insecure boulders where possible and/or placement of catching walls to stop rockfall.
Policy S-8.2 Risk of Slope Instability. Prohibit development from causing or contributing to slope instability.	<b>Consistent.</b> See response to S-8.1. As discussed therein, because cut and fill slopes would be engineered and maintained in accordance with regulatory standards during the lifetime of the landfill and after closure, this alternative would not contribute to slope instability.	<b>Consistent.</b> See response to S-8.1 regarding the Applicant's Proposed Alternative. As with the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, cut and fill slopes would be engineered and maintained in accordance with regulatory standards during the lifetime of the landfill and after closure under this alternative. As such, this alternative would not contribute to slope instability.	<b>Consistent.</b> See response to S-8.1 regarding the Applicant's Proposed Alternative. As with the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, cut and fill slopes would be engineered and maintained in accordance with regulatory standards during the lifetime of the landfill and after closure under this alternative. As such, this alternative would not contribute to slope instability.	<b>Consistent.</b> See response to S-8.1 regarding the Applicant's Proposed Alternative. As with the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, cut and fill slopes would be engineered and maintained in accordance with regulatory standards during the lifetime of the landfill and after closure under this alternative. As such, this alternative would not contribute to slope instability.	<b>Consistent.</b> See response to S-8.1 regarding the Applicant's Proposed Alternative. As with the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, cut and fill slopes would be engineered and maintained in accordance with regulatory standards during the lifetime of the landfill and after closure under this alternative. As such, this alternative would not contribute to slope instability.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
GOAL S-9 Protection of Life and Property. Minimize personal injury and property damage losses resulting from flood events.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed bridge and a portion of the access road are located in the San Luis Rey River floodplain. Implementation of the HRRMP would result in the establishment of a 2.3-acre wetland habitat, which would be located immediately downstream from the north pier of the bridge along the north bank of the river. The creation of the wetland would include excavation to improve connectivity between the river channel and the wetland. This would improve river channel capacity and offset constriction caused by the bridge support piers and, thus, reduce flood hazard. The proposed bridge structure would be founded on deep pile-supported foundations to protect against potential stream scour effects. Standard seat type abutments on pile footing, and five piles would be used to support the bridge. Seat type abutments would be protected from local scour by a surrounding blanket of rock slope protection and deeply founded concrete piles. To reduce scouring, rip-rap or other protective material (armorflex, etc.) would be used at the bridge abutments. These improvements would be installed by the applicant and would not require public works funding.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or flood hazard area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or flood hazard area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or flood hazard area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or flood hazard area.
Policy S-9.1 Floodplain Maps. Manage development based on federal floodplain maps. County maps shall also be referred to and in case of conflict(s) between the County floodplain maps and the federal floodplain maps, the more stringent of restrictions shall apply.	<b>Consistent.</b> Only the bridge and a portion of the access road would be located within the floodplain. However, the siting and design of all facilities on the property, including the bridge, ancillary facilities, landfill prism and borrow/stockpiles would be based the most stringent floodplain mapping and on information provided through hydrological analysis of the site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or flood hazard area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or flood hazard area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or flood hazard area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or flood hazard area.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy S-9.2 Development in Floodplains. Limit development in designated floodplains to decrease the potential for property damage and loss of life from flooding and to avoid the need for engineered channels, channel improvements, and other flood control facilities. Require development to conform to federal flood proofing standards and siting criteria to prevent flow obstruction.	<b>Consistent.</b> No habitable structures would be located within the 100-year floodplain. The proposed ancillary facilities would be located outside the 100-year floodplain. The proposed two-lane bridge would be located within the floodplain. A small section of SR 76 may also be located within the 100-year floodplain. Because these uses are non-habitable these would be consistent with allowable uses. The construction of a 2.3-acre jurisdictional wetland habitat along the northern bank of the river at the bridge would include excavation to improve connectivity between the river channel and the wetland. This excavation would maintain the existing capacity of the river channel and, thus, avoid any flooding that could result from floodway constriction caused by the bridge. The proposed bridge structure will be founded on deep pile-supported foundations to protect against potential stream scour effects. The bridge would be protected from local scour by a surrounding blanket of rock slope protection and deeply founded concrete piles. To reduce scouring, rip-rap or other protective material would be used at the bridge abutments. These improvements would be installed by the applicant and would not require public works funding.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodplain.
Policy S-9.3 Development in Flood Hazard Areas. Require development within mapped flood hazard areas be sited and designed to minimize on and off-site hazards to health, safety, and property due to flooding.	<b>Consistent.</b> No development (commercial or residential) projects are proposed in the flood hazard areas. The alternative's two-lane access road bridge would be constructed in the floodway. Excavation of the riverbed would minimize any increases in 100-year flood elevations. The proposed channel modifications have been designed to maintain the existing channel velocities and flood elevations upstream and downstream of those modifications.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a flood hazard area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a flood hazard area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a flood hazard area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodplain.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy S-9.5 Development in the Floodplain Fringe. Prohibit development in the floodplain fringe when located on Semi-Rural and Rural Land to maintain the capacity of the floodplain, unless specifically allowed in a community plan. For parcels located entirely within a floodplain or without sufficient space for a building pad outside the floodplain, development is limited to a single family home on an existing lot or those uses that do not compromise the environmental attributes of the floodplain or require further channelization.	<b>Consistent.</b> A portion of this site is located within the San Luis River floodway. A two-lane bridge would be constructed across the river in the floodway and support facilities for the landfill would be located to the south of the river, outside the 100-year flood plain. Design features would maintain the existing floodway capacity and reduce flood threat to fringe areas. No habitable structures are proposed in the floodplain or floodplain fringe.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located within a floodplain fringe.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located within a floodplain fringe.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located within a floodplain fringe.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located within a floodplain fringe.
GOAL S-10 Floodway and Floodplain Capacity. Floodways and floodplains that have acceptable capacity to accommodate flood events.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would implement design features (discussed under Policy S-10.1, below) to ensure that existing floodway capacity would be maintained throughout the site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located within a floodplain fringe.
Policy S-10.1 Land Uses within Floodways. Limit new or expanded uses in floodways to agricultural, recreational, and other such low-intensity uses and those that do not result in any increase in flood levels during the occurrence of the base flood discharge, do not include habitable structures, and do not substantially harm, and fully offset, the environmental values of the floodway area. This policy does not apply to minor renovation projects, improvements required to remedy an existing flooding problem, legal sand or gravel mining activities, or public infrastructure.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would not locate habitable structures within the San Luis Rey River floodway. (See response to Goal S-9, above) Through the implementation of Best Management Practices and other diversion of surface runoff, this alternative would not increase the flow or velocity of water to the San Luis Rey River.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The property is not located within a floodway or floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located within a floodplain fringe.
Policy S-10.5 Development Site Improvements. Require development to provide necessary on- and off-site improvements to stormwater runoff and drainage facilities.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide stormwater runoff and drainage facilities, including swales, perimeter channels, desilting basins, filtration areas and other devices to control runoff from this site (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS). No off-site improvements are necessary or proposed.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide stormwater runoff and drainage facilities, including swales, perimeter channels, desilting basins, filtration areas and other devices to control runoff from this site (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS). No off-site improvements are necessary or proposed.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide stormwater runoff and drainage facilities, including swales, perimeter channels, desilting basins, filtration areas and other devices to control runoff from this site (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS). No off-site improvements are necessary or proposed.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide stormwater runoff and drainage facilities, including swales, perimeter channels, desilting basins, filtration areas and other devices to control runoff from this site (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS). No off-site improvements are necessary or proposed.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide stormwater runoff and drainage facilities, including swales, perimeter channels, desilting basins, filtration areas and other devices to control runoff from this site (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS). No off-site improvements are necessary or proposed.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy S-10.6 Stormwater Hydrology. Ensure development avoids diverting drainages, increasing velocities, and altering flow rates to off-site areas to minimize adverse impacts to the area's existing hydrology.	<b>Consistent.</b> The implementation of design features, such as BMP's set forth in the alternative's site specific SWPPP and SUSMP, including surface water capture and diversion measures, would control surface water runoff and, thus ensure that the velocity and flow rates of surface runoff to the river would not be increased (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The implementation of design features, such as BMP's set forth in the alternative's site specific SWPPP, including surface water capture and diversion measures, would control surface water runoff and, thus ensure that the velocity and flow rates of surface runoff to the river would not be increased (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The implementation of design features, such as BMP's set forth in the alternative's site specific SWPPP, including surface water capture and diversion measures, would control surface water runoff and, thus ensure that the velocity and flow rates of surface runoff to the river would not be increased (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The implementation of design features, such as BMP's set forth in the alternative's site specific SWPPP, including surface water capture and diversion measures, would control surface water runoff and, thus ensure that the velocity and flow rates of surface runoff to the river would not be increased (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The implementation of design features, such as BMP's set forth in the alternative's site specific SWPPP, including surface water capture and diversion measures, would control surface water runoff and, thus ensure that the velocity and flow rates of surface runoff to the river would not be increased (see Section 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS).
GOAL S-11 and Policies S-11.1 through S-11.5 apply to the control of hazardous material exposure through land use location; industrial use restrictions; protection of sensitive uses, such as schools, hospitals and residential neighborhoods; contaminated land, and buffering of development adjacent to agricultural operations.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative, a Class III landfill, would accept municipal waste. The landfill would not be used for the disposal of hazardous materials. In addition, a Hazardous Waste Exclusion Program (HWEP), described under the response to Goal S-1, above, would be incorporated into the alternative to address the potential of hazardous waste or other unacceptable wastes being brought to the site. The HWEP is described in detail in Section 4.8, Human Health and Safety, of the EIS.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative, a Class III landfill, would accept municipal waste. The landfill would not be used for the disposal of hazardous materials. In addition, an HWEP, as described under the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, would be incorporated into the alternative to address the potential of hazardous waste or other unacceptable wastes being brought to the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative, a Class III landfill, would accept municipal waste. The landfill would not be used for the disposal of hazardous materials. In addition, an HWEP, as described under the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, would be incorporated into the alternative to address the potential of hazardous waste or other unacceptable wastes being brought to the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative, a Class III landfill, would accept municipal waste. The landfill would not be used for the disposal of hazardous materials. In addition, an HWEP, as described under the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, would be incorporated into the alternative to address the potential of hazardous waste or other unacceptable wastes being brought to the site.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative, a Class III landfill, would accept municipal waste. The landfill would not be used for the disposal of hazardous materials. In addition, an HWEP, as described under the Applicant's Proposed Alternative, would be incorporated into the alternative to address the potential of hazardous waste or other unacceptable wastes being brought to the site.
GOAL S-14 Crime Prevention. Crime prevention through building and site design.	<b>Consistent.</b> Solid waste management facilities generally do not represent a significant source of criminal activity. During the construction and operational phases, the operator would ensure that the perimeter is secured. Entry during business hours would be controlled by site personnel at a single point of access. The use of site security measures would increase the level of safety and security, as well as reduce the impacts on law enforcement services.	<b>Consistent.</b> Solid waste management facilities generally do not represent a significant source of criminal activity. During the construction and operational phases, the operator would ensure that the perimeter is secured. Entry during business hours would be controlled by site personnel at a single point of access. The use of site security measures would increase the level of safety and security, as well as reduce the impacts on law enforcement services.	<b>Consistent.</b> Solid waste management facilities generally do not represent a significant source of criminal activity. During the construction and operational phases, the operator would ensure that the perimeter is secured. Entry during business hours would be controlled by site personnel at a single point of access. The use of site security measures would increase the level of safety and security, as well as reduce the impacts on law enforcement services.	<b>Consistent.</b> Solid waste management facilities generally do not represent a significant source of criminal activity. During the construction and operational phases, the operator would ensure that the perimeter is secured. Entry during business hours would be controlled by site personnel at a single point of access. The use of site security measures would increase the level of safety and security, as well as reduce the impacts on law enforcement services.	<b>Consistent.</b> Solid waste management facilities generally do not represent a significant source of criminal activity. During the construction and operational phases, the operator would ensure that the perimeter is secured. Entry during business hours would be controlled by site personnel at a single point of access. The use of site security measures would increase the level of safety and security, as well as reduce the impacts on law enforcement services.



TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
Policy S-14.1 Vehicular Access to Development. Require development to provide vehicular connections that reduce response times and facilitate access for law enforcement personnel, whenever feasible.	<b>Consistent.</b> The San Diego County Sheriff's Department (SDSD) serves unincorporated San Diego County. The Gregory Canyon site is located within Sheriff's Beat 801 of the Valley Center Substation within the San Marcos Sheriff's Command in the unincorporated County. The Valley Center Substation is located in Valley Center approximately ten miles southeast of the property. The Gregory Canyon property would be accessible via I-15 and SR 76. The landfill operation would be directly accessible from SR 76 and via a two-lane bridge designed for truck traffic and accessible to emergency vehicles.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Aspen Road site is located within Sheriff's Beat 389 of the Fallbrook Substation within the Vista Sheriff's Command in the unincorporated County. The Fallbrook Substation is located in Fallbrook, approximately four miles southwest of the property. Access to the landfill would be via I-15 and Rainbow Glen Road. The landfill operation would be accessed via an approximately 2.25-mile road from Rainbow Glen Road. Although the site is removed from the public road, it would be accessible to truck and emergency vehicle traffics.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Gopher Canyon Road site is located within Sheriff's Beat 325 of the Vista Station within the Vista Sheriff's Command in the unincorporated County. The Vista Station is located in Vista, approximately four miles southwest of property. Access to the landfill would via Gopher Canyon Road. The landfill operation would be accessed via an approximately 0.5-mile road designed for truck traffic and accessible to emergency vehicles.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Merriam Mountain site is located in Sheriff's Beat 326 of the San Marcos Station within the San Marcos Sheriff's Command in the unincorporated County. The San Marcos Station, located at is located in San Marcos, approximately five miles south of the Merriam Mountain site. Access to the landfill would via I-25, Champagne Boulevard and Lawrence Welk Drive. The landfill operation would be accessed via an approximately 0.5-mile road designed for truck traffic and accessible to emergency vehicles.	<b>Consistent.</b> The East Otay Mesa site is located in Sheriff's Beat 877 of the Campo Substation within the Imperial Beach Command. The Campo Substation is located immediately east of the site. Access to the landfill would via Siempre Viva Road and an approximately 1-mile new road designed for truck traffic and accessible to emergency vehicles.
CHAPTER 8 NOISE ELEMENT					
GOAL N-1, Land Use Compatibility: A noise environment throughout the unincorporated County that is compatible with the land uses.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate measures from the Gregory Canyon landfill MMRP and other design features to reduce noise levels and vibration, and to improve compatibility with surrounding residential uses. Design features include the preparation of a blasting plan that would follow regulatory procedures set forth in the San Diego County Water Authority design procedure manual and consistent with U.S. Bureau of Mines RI 8507 standards. If noise levels exceed 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the property line, the applicant shall implement noise abatement measures. Noise verification would be conducted specifically for the flare station prior to commencement of its operation to ensure compliance with the 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ and 60 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the property line and for wildlife habitat, respectively, and unless determined infeasible by CalTrans and not objectionable to adjacent residents, the project applicant would provide a fair share contribution for the cost to install a sound wall in the right-of-way along SR 76 to reduce noise levels (see Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate mitigation measures to reduce on-site noise and vibration, and to improve compatibility with surrounding residential uses. Design features include the preparation of a blasting plan that would follow regulatory procedures set forth in the San Diego County Water Authority design procedure manual and consistent with U.S. Bureau of Mines RI 8507 standards. Noise levels at the property lines near residential uses would be monitored to that construction noise would not exceed 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the property line. If noise levels exceed 62.5 dBA, the operator or contractor would be required to remedy noise levels through changes in equipment, berms, or other measures.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate mitigation measures to reduce on-site noise and vibration, and to improve compatibility with surrounding residential uses. Design features include the preparation of a blasting plan that would follow regulatory procedures set forth in the San Diego County Water Authority design procedure manual and consistent with U.S. Bureau of Mines RI 8507 standards. Noise levels at the property lines near residential uses would be monitored to that construction noise would not exceed 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the property line. If noise levels exceed 62.5 dBA, the operator or contractor would be required to remedy noise levels through changes in equipment, berms, or other measures.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate mitigation measures to reduce on-site noise and vibration, and to improve compatibility with surrounding residential uses. Design features include the preparation of a blasting plan that would follow regulatory procedures set forth in the San Diego County Water Authority design procedure manual and consistent with U.S. Bureau of Mines RI 8507 standards. Noise levels at the property lines near residential uses would be monitored to that construction noise would not exceed 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the property line. If noise levels exceed 62.5 dBA, the operator or contractor would be required to remedy noise levels through changes in equipment, berms, or other measures.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate mitigation measures to reduce on-site noise and vibration, and to improve compatibility with surrounding residential uses. Design features include the preparation of a blasting plan that would follow regulatory procedures set forth in the San Diego County Water Authority design procedure manual and consistent with U.S. Bureau of Mines RI 8507 standards. Noise levels at the property lines near residential uses would be monitored to that construction noise would not exceed 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the property line. If noise levels exceed 62.5 dBA, the operator or contractor would be required to remedy noise levels through changes in equipment, berms, or other measures.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
Policy N-1.1: Noise Compatibility Guidelines. Use the Noise Compatibility Guidelines (Table N-1) and the Noise Standards (Table N-2) as a guide in determining the acceptability of exterior and interior noise for proposed land uses.	<b>Consistent.</b> The noise impact analysis in the EIS takes into account the San Diego County Noise Ordinance Exterior Noise Standards in the analysis of noise impacts.	<b>Consistent.</b> The noise impact analysis in the EIS takes into account the San Diego County Noise Ordinance Exterior Noise Standards in the analysis of noise impacts.	<b>Consistent.</b> The noise impact analysis in the EIS takes into account the San Diego County Noise Ordinance Exterior Noise Standards in the analysis of noise impacts.	<b>Consistent.</b> The noise impact analysis in the EIS takes into account the San Diego County Noise Ordinance Exterior Noise Standards in the analysis of noise impacts.	<b>Consistent.</b> The noise impact analysis in the EIS takes into account the San Diego County Noise Ordinance Exterior Noise Standards in the analysis of noise impacts.
<p>N-1.2 Noise Management Strategies. Require the following strategies as higher priorities than construction of conventional noise barriers where noise abatement is necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Avoid placement of noise sensitive uses within noisy areas</li> <li>- Increase setbacks between noise generators and noise sensitive uses</li> <li>- Orient buildings such that the noise sensitive portions of an alternative are shielded from noise sources</li> <li>- Use sound-attenuating architectural design and building features</li> <li>- Employ technologies when appropriate that reduce noise generation (i.e. alternative pavement materials on roadways)</li> </ul>	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate noise management strategies summarized in the discussion under Goal N-1, and described in detail in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS. Strategies include noise monitoring at the property line during construction, the preparation of a blasting plan that would follow regulatory procedures set forth in the San Diego County Water Authority design procedure manual and consistent with U.S. Bureau of Mines RI 8507 standards, setback of rock crushing and tire shredding operations from off-site sensitive receptors, no concurrent shredding and blasting, setback of the flare station, the use of berms as needed, and other measures.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate noise management strategies summarized in the discussion under Goal N-1, and described in detail in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS. Strategies include noise monitoring at the property line during construction, the preparation of a blasting plan that would follow regulatory procedures set forth in the San Diego County Water Authority design procedure manual and consistent with U.S. Bureau of Mines RI 8507 standards, setback of rock crushing and tire shredding operations from off-site sensitive receptors, no concurrent shredding and blasting, setback of the flaring station, the use of berms as needed, and other measures.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate noise management strategies summarized in the discussion under Goal N-1, and described in detail in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS. Strategies include noise monitoring at the property line during construction, the preparation of a blasting plan that would follow regulatory procedures consistent with U.S. Bureau of Mines RI 8507 standards, setback of rock crushing and tire shredding operations from off-site sensitive receptors, no concurrent shredding and blasting, setback of the flaring station, the use of berms as needed, and other measures.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate noise management strategies summarized in the discussion under Goal N-1, and described in detail in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS. Strategies include noise monitoring at the property line during construction, the preparation of a blasting plan that would follow regulatory procedures consistent with U.S. Bureau of Mines RI 8507 standards, setback of rock crushing and tire shredding operations from off-site sensitive receptors, no concurrent shredding and blasting, setback of the flaring station, the use of berms as needed, and other measures.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would incorporate noise management strategies summarized in the discussion under Goal N-1, and described in detail in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS. Strategies include noise monitoring at the property line during construction, the preparation of a blasting plan that would follow regulatory procedures consistent with U.S. Bureau of Mines RI 8507 standards, setback of rock crushing and tire shredding operations from off-site sensitive receptors, no concurrent shredding and blasting, setback of the flaring station, the use of berms as needed, and other measures.
N-1.3 Sound Walls. Discourage the use of noise walls. In areas where the use of noise walls cannot be avoided, evaluate and require where feasible, a combination of walls and earthen berms and require the use of vegetation or other visual screening methods to soften the visual appearance of the wall.	<b>Consistent.</b> Because of the character of the site and distance between activities and nearby residential uses, berms, as described above, would be used to reduce construction and operational noise. Berms that would attenuate noise levels during alternative operation would be landscaped to reduce the visual appearance of the berm.	<b>Consistent.</b> If required, berms would be used to reduce construction and operational noise. Berms that would attenuate noise levels during alternative operation would be landscaped to reduce the visual appearance of the berm.	<b>Consistent.</b> If required, berms would be used to reduce construction and operational noise. Berms that would attenuate noise levels during alternative operation would be landscaped to reduce the visual appearance of the berm.	<b>Consistent.</b> If required, berms would be used to reduce construction and operational noise. Berms that would attenuate noise levels during alternative operation would be landscaped to reduce the visual appearance of the berm.	<b>Consistent.</b> If required, berms would be used to reduce construction and operational noise. Berms that would attenuate noise levels during alternative operation would be landscaped to reduce the visual appearance of the berm.
N-1.5 Regional Noise Impacts. Work with local and regional transit agencies and/or other jurisdictions, as appropriate, to provide services or facilities to minimize regional traffic noise and other sources of noise in the County.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would provide sound attenuation walls along SR 76 as needed, if approved by the State Department of Transportation or affected land owners.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Landfill truck traffic noise is not expected to exceed 60 CNEL on adjacent public roads in proximity to residential uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Landfill truck traffic noise is not expected to exceed 60 CNEL on adjacent public roads in proximity to residential uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Landfill truck traffic noise is not expected to exceed 60 CNEL on adjacent public roads in proximity to residential uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Landfill truck traffic noise is not expected to exceed 60 CNEL on adjacent public roads in proximity to any residential uses.

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
GOAL N-2 Protection of Noise Sensitive Uses. A noise environment that minimizes exposure of noise sensitive land uses to excessive, unsafe, or otherwise disruptive noise levels.	<b>Consistent.</b> With the exception of traffic noise, described under Goal N-4, below, alternative construction and operational noise would be reduced to acceptable levels at the nearest noise sensitive land uses. During construction, activities within the landfill footprint could exceed the 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ noise standard established by the County Noise Ordinance at the property line of nearby residential uses. Design features include monitoring of noise levels at the property lines of affected residential uses in the first year of the initial construction and whenever the construction operation changes. If noise levels exceed 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the property line, the applicant would implement some measures to reduce noise levels to below 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ (please refer to the summary under Goal N-1 and detailed discussion in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> With the exception of traffic noise, described under Goal N-4, below, alternative construction and operational noise would be reduced to acceptable levels at the nearest noise sensitive land uses. During construction, activities within the landfill footprint could exceed the 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ noise standard established by the County Noise Ordinance at the property line of nearby residential uses. Design features include monitoring of noise levels at the property lines of affected residential uses in the first year of the initial construction and whenever the construction operation changes. If noise levels exceed 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the property line, the applicant would implement some measures to reduce noise levels to below 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ (please refer to the summary under Goal N-1 and detailed discussion in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> With the exception of traffic noise, described under Goal N-4, below, alternative construction and operational noise would be reduced to acceptable levels at the nearest noise sensitive land uses. During construction, activities within the landfill footprint could exceed the 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ noise standard established by the County Noise Ordinance at the property line of nearby residential uses. Design features include monitoring of noise levels at the property lines of affected residential uses in the first year of the initial construction and whenever the construction operation changes. If noise levels exceed 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the property line, the applicant would implement some measures to reduce noise levels to below 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ (please refer to the summary under Goal N-1 and detailed discussion in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> With the exception of traffic noise, described under Goal N-4, below, alternative construction and operational noise would be reduced to acceptable levels at the nearest noise sensitive land uses. During construction, activities within the landfill footprint could exceed the 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ noise standard established by the County Noise Ordinance at the property line of nearby residential uses. Design features include monitoring of noise levels at the property lines of affected residential uses in the first year of the initial construction and whenever the construction operation changes. If noise levels exceed 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the property line, the applicant would implement some measures to reduce noise levels to below 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ (please refer to the summary under Goal N-1 and detailed discussion in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> With the exception of traffic noise, described under Goal N-4, below, alternative construction and operational noise would be reduced to acceptable levels at the nearest noise sensitive land uses. During construction, activities within the landfill footprint could exceed the 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ noise standard established by the County Noise Ordinance at the property line of nearby residential uses. Design features include monitoring of noise levels at the property lines of affected residential uses in the first year of the initial construction and whenever the construction operation changes. If noise levels exceed 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the property line, the applicant would implement some measures to reduce noise levels to below 62.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ (please refer to the summary under Goal N-1 and detailed discussion in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS).
Policy N-2.1 Development Impacts to Noise Sensitive Land Uses. Require an acoustical study to identify inappropriate noise level where development may directly result in any existing or future noise sensitive land uses being subject to noise levels equal to or greater than 60 CNEL and require mitigation for sensitive uses in compliance with the noise standards listed in Table N-2.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> Acoustical analyses of the alternative indicate that noise levels would increase above 60 CNEL because of existing high noise levels at sensitive receptor locations (residential uses) along SR 76. Truck traffic could result in an increase of 0.1 – 4.2 dBA, over the ambient level. Although sound walls along the roadway could reduce levels to below this level, this mitigation measure may not be acceptable to the adjacent sensitive uses. As such, traffic noise impacts would be significant and the alternative would not be consistent with this policy.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> Long-term operational noise associated with the Aspen Road Alternative would expose nearby residential uses to noise levels in excess of applicable standards at the nearest property line. The maximum noise levels from periodic construction and landfill operations at the nearest residential property line would be 67.5 dBA including implementation of the design features, which would exceed the noise standard of 62.5 dBA. To compensate for this impact, mitigation would be required to monitor, reduce the size or number of construction equipment, and install a berm or sound barrier, as necessary to reduce noise levels to 62.5 dBA. With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts from periodic construction and landfill operations would be below the criterion. Blasting would be infrequent, but may cause noise levels to exceed 62.5 dBA at the nearest residential property line, which would	<b>Not Consistent.</b> Long-term operational noise associated with the Gopher Canyon Road Alternative would expose nearby residential uses to noise levels of 67.5 dBA with implementation of the design features, which would exceed the noise standard of 62.5 dBA. To reduce this significant impact, mitigation would be required to monitor, reduce the size or number of construction equipment, and install a berm or sound barrier, as necessary to reduce noise levels to 62.5 dBA. With implementation of the mitigation measures, no significant adverse noise effects from periodic construction and landfill operations would occur. Blasting would be infrequent, but may cause noise levels to exceed 62.5 dBA at the nearest residential property line, which is considered a significant and unavoidable effect. Traffic noise associated with the Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	<b>Not Consistent.</b> Long-term operational noise associated with the Merriam Mountain Alternative would expose nearby residential uses to noise levels in excess of applicable standards at the nearest property line. The maximum noise levels from periodic construction and landfill operations at the nearest residential property line would be 63.5 dBA including implementation of the design features, which would exceed the criterion of 62.5 dBA for residential uses. Mitigation measures, such as a reduction in the size or number of construction equipment and installation of a berm or sound barrier, as necessary would be required to reduce noise levels to 62.5 dBA. With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts from periodic construction and landfill operations would be below the criterion. Blasting would be infrequent, but may cause noise levels to exceed 62.5 dBA at the nearest	<b>Not Consistent.</b> Long-term operational noise associated with the East Otay Mesa Alternative would expose nearby residential uses to noise levels in excess of applicable standards at the nearest property line. The maximum operational noise levels at the nearest residential property line would be 63 dBA with implementation of the design features, which would exceed the noise standard of 62.5 dBA. To compensate for this impact, mitigation would be required to monitor, reduce the size or number of construction equipment, and install a berm or sound barrier, as necessary to reduce noise levels to 62.5 dBA. With implementation of the mitigation measures, no significant adverse noise effects from periodic construction and landfill operations would occur. Blasting would be infrequent, but may cause noise levels to exceed 62.5 dBA at the nearest residential property line, which is considered a significant adverse effect. Traffic noise associated

TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant’s Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Mesa Alternative
		result in a significant adverse effect. Traffic noise associated with the Aspen Road Alternative would increase the noise levels at residences with existing exterior noise levels in excess of 60 dBA CNEL. Therefore, noise impacts would be significant and the alternative would not be consistent with this policy.	would increase the noise levels at residences with existing exterior noise levels in excess of 60 dBA CNEL. Therefore, noise impacts would be significant and the alternative would not be consistent with this policy.	residential property line, which would result in a significant adverse effect. Traffic noise associated with the Merriam Mountain Alternative would increase the noise levels at residences with existing noise levels in excess of 60 dBA CNEL. Therefore, noise impacts would be significant and the alternative would not be consistent with this policy.	with the East Otay Mesa Alternative would increase the noise levels at residences with existing exterior noise levels in excess of 60 dBA CNEL. Therefore, noise impacts would be significant and the alternative would not be consistent with this policy.
GOAL N-3 Groundborne Vibration. An environment that minimizes exposure of sensitive land uses to the harmful effects of excessive groundborne vibration.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would generate groundborne vibration as a result of construction blasting and drilling. However, with the incorporation of design features, impacts to nearby sensitive receptors (residential uses) would not result in harmful effects. Design features include: compliance with criteria adopted in San Diego County Water Authority design procedure manual 02229-3 (February 1995); blasting done by a State-licensed blasting contractor with adequate blasting insurance; blasting will not occur within 500 feet of the existing pipelines 1 and 2 unless approved by SDCWA; use of seismograph instrumentation along the aqueduct alignment in the vicinity of any blasting operations; all drilling and blasting shall be performed during hours designated by local, State, or federal ordinances.	<b>Consistent.</b> Mitigation measures set forth in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS would reduce groundborne vibration impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigations for this alternative are consistent with design features for the Applicant’s Proposed Alternative, also listed in the Gregory Canyon Landfill MMRP.	<b>Consistent.</b> Mitigation measures set forth in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS would reduce groundborne vibration impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigations for this alternative are consistent with design features for the Applicant’s Proposed Alternative, also listed in the Gregory Canyon Landfill MMRP.	<b>Consistent.</b> Mitigation measures set forth in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS would reduce groundborne vibration impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigations for this alternative are consistent with design features for the Applicant’s Proposed Alternative, also listed in the Gregory Canyon Landfill MMRP.	<b>Consistent.</b> Mitigation measures set forth in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS would reduce groundborne vibration impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigations for this alternative are consistent with design features for the Applicant’s Proposed Alternative, also listed in the Gregory Canyon Landfill MMRP.
Policy N-3.1 Groundborne Vibration. Use the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Railroad Administration guidelines, where appropriate, to limit the extent of exposure that sensitive uses may have to groundborne vibration from trains, construction equipment, and other sources.	<b>Consistent.</b> The vibration impact criteria used in the analysis of the impacts of the alternative is based on the U.S. Bureau of Mines Structure Response and Damage Produced by Ground Vibrations from Surface Blasting (RI 8507), which identifies maximum acceptable transverse ground velocity levels. These criteria set the maximum peak particle velocity as a function of frequency and are consistent with the vibration source generated by the alternative’s drilling and blasting activities. RI 8507was adopted by the San Diego County Water Authority for similar activities. These criteria would be consistent with the type of anticipated activity occurring in the	<b>Consistent.</b> The vibration impact criteria used in the analysis of the impacts of the alternative is based on the U.S. Bureau of Mines Structure Response and Damage Produced by Ground Vibrations from Surface Blasting (RI 8507), which identifies maximum acceptable transverse ground velocity levels. These criteria set the maximum peak particle velocity as a function of frequency and are consistent with the vibration source generated by the alternative’s drilling and blasting activities. RI 8507was adopted by the San Diego County Water Authority for similar activities. These criteria would be consistent with the type of anticipated	<b>Consistent.</b> The vibration impact criteria used in the analysis of the impacts of the alternative is based on the U.S. Bureau of Mines Structure Response and Damage Produced by Ground Vibrations from Surface Blasting (RI 8507), which identifies maximum acceptable transverse ground velocity levels. These criteria set the maximum peak particle velocity as a function of frequency and are consistent with the vibration source generated by the alternative’s drilling and blasting activities. RI 8507was adopted by the San Diego County Water Authority for similar activities. These criteria would be	<b>Consistent.</b> The vibration impact criteria used in the analysis of the impacts of the alternative is based on the U.S. Bureau of Mines Structure Response and Damage Produced by Ground Vibrations from Surface Blasting (RI 8507), which identifies maximum acceptable transverse ground velocity levels. These criteria set the maximum peak particle velocity as a function of frequency and are consistent with the vibration source generated by the alternative’s drilling and blasting activities. RI 8507was adopted by the San Diego County Water Authority for similar activities. These criteria would be consistent with the type of anticipated	<b>Consistent.</b> The vibration impact criteria used in the analysis of the impacts of the alternative is based on the U.S. Bureau of Mines Structure Response and Damage Produced by Ground Vibrations from Surface Blasting (RI 8507), which identifies maximum acceptable transverse ground velocity levels. These criteria set the maximum peak particle velocity as a function of frequency and are consistent with the vibration source generated by the alternative’s drilling and blasting activities. RI 8507was adopted by the San Diego County Water Authority for similar activities. These criteria would be consistent with the type of anticipated

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
	construction and operation of the landfill and, as such, would be consistent with the intent of this policy.	activity occurring in the construction and operation of the landfill and, as such, would be consistent with the intent of this policy.	consistent with the type of anticipated activity occurring in the construction and operation of the landfill and, as such, would be consistent with the intent of this policy.	activity occurring in the construction and operation of the landfill and, as such, would be consistent with the intent of this policy.	activity occurring in the construction and operation of the landfill and, as such, would be consistent with the intent of this policy.
GOAL N-4 Transportation-Related Noise Generators. A noise environment that reduces noise generated from traffic, railroads, and airports to the extent feasible.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> Existing noise levels at residences located on SR 76 between I-15 and Rice Canyon Road exceed the County's standard of 60 CNEL under existing conditions. The alternative would increase noise levels by 0.1 to 4.2 dBA. While sound walls could reduce the alternative's contribution of noise levels to a level of less than significant, because the sound wall would need to be installed on property that is not owned by the applicant and the property owner may object to the installation of a sound wall, the mitigation measure is considered infeasible. Therefore, because the site is within a corridor that has noise levels that exceed the County standard and this alternative would contribute to a degraded noise environment (and mitigation measures are not assured), this alternative would exceed criteria thresholds for traffic noise.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> It is expected that the alternative would increase traffic noise to above acceptable levels (please refer to the discussion under Policy N-4.1).	<b>Not Consistent.</b> It is expected that the alternative would increase traffic noise to above acceptable levels (please refer to the discussion under Policy N-4.1).	<b>Not Consistent.</b> It is expected that the alternative would increase traffic noise to above acceptable levels (please refer to the discussion under Policy N-4.1).	<b>Not Consistent.</b> It is expected that the alternative would increase traffic noise to above acceptable levels (please refer to the discussion under Policy N-4.1).
Policy N-4.1 Traffic Noise. Require that projects proposing General Plan amendments that increase the average daily traffic beyond what is anticipated in this General Plan do not increase cumulative traffic noise to off-site noise sensitive land uses beyond acceptable levels.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not require a General Plan amendment.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would require a General Plan Amendment to change the existing zoning and land use designation. The addition of potential truck traffic of up to 1,346 trips per day (673 truck roundtrips on Rainbow Glen Road) would exceed potential vehicle trips under the buildout of the property. Designated density of the property averages approximately (1 unit/20 acres), which would result in up to 23 dwelling units. Assuming 10 trips a day per dwelling unit, the existing General Plan designation would yield approximately 230 daily trips. Because of relatively low ambient noise levels along Rainbow Glen Road, the estimated increase of 0.1 – 4.2 dBA generated by truck traffic would not exceed the acceptable ambient level of 60 CNEL at sensitive receptor locations.	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would require a General Plan Amendment to change the existing zoning and land use designation. The addition of potential truck traffic of up to 1,346 trips per day (673 truck roundtrips on Gopher Canyon Road) would exceed potential vehicle trips under the buildout of the property. The General Plan designation of the property would allow a density of 1 unit/4 acres on approximately 25 percent of the property, which is consistent with the approved 35 units in the Panoramic Estates subdivision on the site. Assuming 10 trips a day per dwelling unit, the existing General Plan designation would yield approximately 350 daily trips. Because of relatively low ambient noise levels along Gopher Canyon Road, the estimated increase of 0.1 – 4.2 dBA generated	<b>Consistent.</b> The alternative would require a General Plan Amendment to change the existing zoning and land use designation. The addition of potential truck traffic of up to 1,346 trips per day (673 truck roundtrips) would exceed potential vehicle trips under the buildout of the property. The General Plan designation of the property would allow a density of 1 unit/40 acres, which would allow up to approximately 14 dwelling units. Assuming 10 trips a day per dwelling unit, the existing General Plan designation would yield approximately 140 daily trips. However, because of the distance between the site and the nearest residential uses and the intervening I-15 freeway, the alternative's truck traffic is not expected to increase noise at these sensitive receptor sites to above ambient levels.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not require a General Plan amendment.

**TABLE 1 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE  
APPLICABLE POLICIES OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Mesa Alternative</b>
			by truck traffic would not exceed the acceptable ambient level of 60 CNEL at sensitive receptor locations.		
GOAL N-5 Non-transportation-Related Noise Sources. A noise environment that provides minimal noise spillovers from industrial, commercial, agricultural, extractive, and similar facilities to adjacent residential neighborhoods.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described under Goal N-2, above, the design features would mitigate non-transportation-related noise impacts at residential uses on neighboring properties to less than significant levels.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described under Goal N-2, above, mitigation measures would reduce non-transportation-related noise impacts at residential uses on neighboring properties to less than significant levels.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described under Goal N-2, above, mitigation measures would reduce non-transportation-related noise impacts at residential uses on neighboring properties to less than significant levels.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described under Goal N-2, above, mitigation measures would reduce non-transportation-related noise impacts at residential uses on neighboring properties to less than significant levels.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described under Goal N-2, above, mitigation measures would reduce non-transportation-related noise impacts at residential uses in the area to less than significant levels.
Policy N-5.1 Truck Access. Design development so that automobile and truck access to industrial and commercial properties abutting residential properties is located at the maximum practical distance from residential zones.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although this policy applies to the County's land planning efforts in providing for separation between residential zones and roads that industrial and commercial properties, the alternative would support this policy in that the area along the access highway (SR 76) is generally low density residential. Because there are fewer homes in the area than in a more urban setting, there would be less exposure of residents to roadway noise.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although this policy applies to the County's land planning efforts in providing for separation between residential zones and roads that industrial and commercial properties, the alternative would support this policy in that the area along the access roadway (Rainbow Glen Road) is generally low density residential. Because there are fewer homes in the area than in a more urban setting, there would be less exposure of residents to roadway noise.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although this policy applies to the County's land planning efforts in providing for separation between residential zones and roads that industrial and commercial properties, the alternative would support this policy in that the area along the access roadway (Gopher Canyon Road) is generally low density residential. Because there are fewer homes in the area than in a more urban setting, there would be less exposure of residents to roadway noise.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although this policy applies to the County's land planning efforts in providing for separation between residential zones and roads that industrial and commercial properties, the alternative would support this policy in that the area between the property and I-15 is not developed with residential uses.	<b>Consistent.</b> Although this policy applies to the County's land planning efforts in providing for separation between residential zones and roads that industrial and commercial properties, the alternative would support this policy in that the area between the property and SR 905/SR125 is not developed with residential uses.
Policy N-5.2 Noise-Generating Industrial Facilities. Locate noise-generating industrial facilities at the maximum practical distance from residential zones. Use setbacks between noise generating equipment and noise sensitive uses and limit the operation of noise generating activities to daytime hours as appropriate where such activities may affect residential uses.	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill would be in operation between Monday and Friday between 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. and on Saturday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Residences are located on the north side of SR 76 between I-15 and Rice Canyon Road (see the respective Gregory Canyon area noise contour map in Section 4.11, Noise and Vibration, of the EIS).	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill would be in operation between Monday and Friday between 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. and on Saturday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Residences are located to the east and west of the property and along Rainbow Glen Road between Oak Crest Road and I-15.	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill would be in operation between Monday and Friday between 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. and on Saturday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Residences are located at the west edge of the property and along Gopher Canyon Road, between the site and I-15.	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill would be in operation between Monday and Friday between 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. and on Saturday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. The area is sparsely settled and the nearest residences are located to the east I-15.	<b>Consistent.</b> The landfill would be in operation between Monday and Friday between 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. and on Saturday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. The area is sparsely settled and the nearest residences are located to the south of the international border.
Policy N-6.4 Hours of Construction. Require development to limit the hours of operation as appropriate for non-emergency construction and maintenance, trash collection, and parking lot sweeper activity near noise sensitive land uses.	<b>Consistent.</b> Construction activities would be limited to between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M., Monday through Friday and 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. on Saturday. Construction would not be permitted on Sundays or federal holidays.	<b>Consistent.</b> Construction activities would be limited to between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M., Monday through Friday and 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. on Saturday. Construction would not be permitted on Sundays or federal holidays.	<b>Consistent.</b> Construction activities would be limited to between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M., Monday through Friday and 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. on Saturday. Construction would not be permitted on Sundays or federal holidays.	<b>Consistent.</b> Construction activities would be limited to between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M., Monday through Friday and 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. on Saturday. Construction would not be permitted on Sundays or federal holidays.	<b>Consistent.</b> Construction activities would be limited to between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M., Monday through Friday and 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. on Saturday. Construction would not be permitted on Sundays or federal holidays.

TABLE 2 - COMPARISON OF ALTERNITVES TO APPLICABLE POLICIES OF COMMUNITY PLANS/REGIONAL PLANS

APPLICANT’S PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE	ASPEN ROAD ALTERNATIVE	GOPHER CANYON ROAD ALTERNATIVE	MERRIAM MOUNTAIN ALTERNATIVE	EAST OTAY MESA ALTERNATIVE
Pala Pauma Subregional Plan	Fallbrook Community Plan	Bonsall Community Plan	North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan	Otay Subregional Plan
The Applicant’s Proposed Alternative is located within the boundaries of the Pala Pauma Subregional Plan:	The Aspen Road Alternative is located within the boundaries of the Fallbrook Community Plan and is compared to the Community Plan below.	The Gopher Canyon Road Alternative is located within the boundaries of the Bonsall Community Plan:	The Merriam Mountain Alternative is located within the boundaries of the Twin Oaks Valley Community of the North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan:	The East Otay Mesa Alternative is located within the boundaries of the Otay Subregional Plan:
<p>Chapter 1 (Land Use) Policy A. Orderly, planned growth that is provided as needs arise and essential services such as water, sewer, fire protection, and schools are made available:</p> <p><b>Not Applicable.</b> The land use policy applies to the growth of community residential, commercial, and industrial uses that are dependent on the provision of services, such as schools. The Applicant’s Proposed Alternative would be regional in character and, as it would not be dependent on local services, the community growth category is not applicable.</p>	<p>Chapter 1 (Land Use) Goal LU 1.1. Perpetuate the existing rural charm and village atmosphere while accommodating growth.</p> <p><b>Not Consistent.</b> The Aspen Road Alternative would introduce elements that are not rural in character, including truck traffic, noise, and activity that would not be consistent with the rural character and zoning of the property and the surrounding area.</p>	<p>Chapter 1 (Land Use – Community Character) Goal LU-1.1 A unique balance of Bonsall’s rural agriculture, estate lots, ridgelines, equestrian uses, and open space land uses within the community, including open space and low density buffers that separate the community from adjacent cities and unincorporated community and new development that conserves natural resources and topography:</p> <p><b>Not Consistent:</b> The Gopher Canyon Road Alternative would introduce elements that are not consistent with Specific Plan, rural, and semi-rural residential zoning of the property and the surrounding area. The alternative would comprise more than 200 acres of grading and cause topographic change. However, the alternative would not be inconsistent with the character of the quarry operation located along the easterly edge of the property.</p>	<p>Chapter 3 (Land Use) The County will cooperate in the planning and regulating of growth in unincorporated territory within each City’s sphere of influence. Future County decisions on proposed project in the sphere areas will take each City’s planning objectives into consideration.</p> <p><b>Not Consistent.</b> The property is located within the City of San Marcos’ sphere of influence, within the unincorporated area of the Twin Oaks Valley Neighborhood.</p> <p>The San Marcos General Plan describes this area as</p> <p>Predominantly hillside residential single-family homes on large lots. The County’s underlying land use designation for the Merriam Mountain property is Rural Lands (RL-20) (which corresponds to the City of San Marcos description of hillside residential (1 du per 4 to 20 acres). The Merriam Mountain Alternative would not be consistent with this land use designation. .</p>	<p>Chapter 1.A. (Land Use Goal) Provide a land use pattern sensitive to the opportunities and the constraints of the Subregion. Because:</p> <p>1) the second international border crossing, the State Correctional Facility, and the increased industrial development immediately cross the Mexican Border have increased development pressures on the Subregion, in general, and on Otay Mesa in particular, and</p> <p>2) Otay Mesa contains large, level, undeveloped and relatively inexpensive parcels of land, and is located near a large labor pool, moderately priced housing, and a general aviation airport, which makes it highly suitable for large scale industrial development, and</p> <p>3) the anticipated development of Otay Mesa represents potentially significant economic benefits to the Subregion, and</p> <p>4) the Subregion contains valuable agricultural land, which, although adversely affected by high water and labor costs, should be encouraged during the extended build out period of Otay Mesa.</p> <p><b>Consistent:</b> The site is designated and zoned Public/Semi-Public Lands (Solid Waste Facility). The alternative is consistent with the anticipated industrial character of the area. The Specific Plan provides a 1,000 foot buffer adjacent to the landfill. While a portion of the site is designated as FMMP Farmland of Local Importance (based on former farming on the site and surrounding area), the zoning does not anticipate agricultural use of the site. The proposed use would not be incompatible with any off-site agricultural uses.</p>

TABLE 2 - COMPARISON OF THE APPLICABLE POLICIES OF COMMUNITY PLANS/SUBREGIONAL PLANS (CONTINUED)

APPLICANT’S PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE	ASPEN ROAD ALTERNATIVE	GOPHER CANYON ROAD ALTERNATIVE	MERRIAM MOUNTAIN ALTERNATIVE	EAST OTAY MESA ALTERNATIVE
Pala Pauma Subregional Plan	Fallbrook Community Plan	Bonsall Community Plan	North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan	Otay Subregional Plan
<p>Chapter 1 (Land Use) Policy B.1. The Pala/Pauma Subregional Plan will be Used to Implement the Land Use Categories and designations contained in the County General Plan Land Use Element:</p> <p><b>Consistent.</b> Under the County General Plan, the Gregory Canyon site is designated Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility). The Applicant’s Proposed Alternative would be consistent with this land use designation.</p>	<p>Chapter 2 (Circulation and Mobility – Access Roads). Goal CM 1.3. A road network that routes traffic both through and around the village areas to limit community disruption, as well as reduce noise pollution and traffic congestion and Policy 1.3.1, Locate arterial roads to avoid residential neighborhoods by routing them around rather than through residential areas:</p> <p><b>Not Consistent.</b> The Aspen Road Alternative would increase truck traffic and would require the development of a new road in an existing rural residential area.</p>	<p>Chapter 1 (Land Use – Community Character) Goal 1.2 Continued development that is appropriately designed to match the rural character of the Bonsall community:</p> <p><b>Not Consistent:</b> The Gopher Canyon Road Alternative would introduce elements that are not rural in character, including truck traffic, noise, and activity that would not be consistent with the rural character and rural and semi-rural uses that make up the majority of the surrounding area.</p>	<p>Chapter 3 (Conservation Designate Resource Conservation Areas) The Resource Conservation Area (RCA) designation is applied to protect sensitive biological, archaeological, aesthetic, mineral, and water resources:</p> <p><b>Not Consistent.</b> The Merriam Mountains are designated as resource conservation area (RCA) #23. The landfill would cause a significant impact to natural landform character with respect to contrast with the surrounding mountains, blockage of a view corridor and domination of the ridgeline as viewed from I-15. The area is also designated as MRZ-2, indicating the presence of mineral resources. Conversion of the area to landfill activities could affect access to the currently mined granite resources, which would be considered a potentially significant impact on the availability of mineral resources. Because these impacts would not be reduced to less than significant levels, the alternative would not be consistent with this policy. However, impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, and ground and surface water resources would be reduced to a less than significant level through the implementation of mitigation measures described in Sections 4.4, Biological Resources; 4.5 Cultural Resources; 4.9, Hydrogeological Resources; and 4.14, Surface Hydrology of the EIS, respectively.</p>	<p>Chapter 1.D. (Conservation Goal) Protect environmental resources. Because: 1) the Subregion contains vernal pools, endangered plants, and wildlife habitats that are not suitable for urbanization, and 2) Resource Conservation Areas have been identified to help protect valuable environmental resources throughout the area, it is the goal of the County of San Diego to protect the environmental resources designated as “Resource Conservation Areas” in the Subregional Plan.</p> <p><b>Partially Consistent.</b> As a result of the passage of Proposition A, the site is designated Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility). The East Otay Mesa Alternative is located within resource conservation area and designated as RCA #118. Although the landfill would not significantly impact aesthetic resources, it would adversely impact 29 acres of mima mound–vernal pool complex within the RCA. Therefore, it would not be fully consistent with the objective of this goal to protect valuable environmental resources in this area. (See Section 4.4, Biological Resources, of this EIS.)</p>



TABLE 2 - COMPARISON OF THE APPLICABLE POLICIES OF COMMUNITY PLANS/SUBREGIONAL PLANS (CONTINUED)

APPLICANT’S PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE	ASPEN ROAD ALTERNATIVE	GOPHER CANYON ROAD ALTERNATIVE	MERRIAM MOUNTAIN ALTERNATIVE	EAST OTAY MESA ALTERNATIVE
Pala Pauma Subregional Plan	Fallbrook Community Plan	Bonsall Community Plan	North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan	Otay Subregional Plan
<p>Chapter 1 (Land Use) Policy B.4. Protect sensitive biological resources through the Resource Conservation Area (RCA) designation. Apply low density zoning plan designations and zoning to Resource Conservation Areas:</p> <p><b>Consistent.</b> The Gregory Mountain portion of the site is located within the RCA designation. This designation encompasses the entire east and west slopes and the crest of the mountain. The landfill would be located within the canyon at the west side of Gregory Mountain and would maintain a gap of at least 700 feet above the top of the landfill and the crest of Gregory Mountain would be maintained. The landfill would adversely impact biotic resources within the canyon at the west flank of Gregory Mountain and, as such, would not be consistent with the purpose of the RCA to conserve biotic resources. The HRRMP, which would require the preservation and restoration of biological resources would require the replacement of oak trees at a 2:1 ratio and replacement of existing degraded native vegetation through on- and off-site restoration. Replanting of native vegetation and trees would be required by the Landscape Plan. At the closure of the landfill, the prism would be covered and replanted with native species. Because the loss of biotic resources would be mitigated through the HRRMP, the alternative would be ultimately consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>Chapter 2 (Circulation and Mobility – Bicycle and Trails) Goal CM 6.1 A system of trails and pathways for non-motorized travel connected to civic, commercial, residential, and employment uses.</p> <p><b>Not Consistent.</b> Several potential trails recommended by the CTMP cross the property, including the Fallbrook Red Mountain Trail, the Fallbrook Red Mountain Tierra Nuevo Trail, the Fallbrook Red Mountain Aspen Drive Trail, and the Fallbrook Red Mountain Reservoir Trail. The landfill footprint would be located at the proposed Fallbrook Red Mountain Tierra Nuevo Trail site in the northern portion of the site. The western portion of the landfill footprint and the western stockpile area would conflict with the proposed alignment of the Fallbrook Red Mountain Trail. The landfill footprint would conflict with the proposed Fallbrook Red Mountain Aspen Drive Trail, which crosses the central portion of the site along Aspen Road. Given that the CTMP proposes the intersection of several trails on the Aspen Road Alternative site, relocation of trail alignment could be difficult.</p>	<p>Chapter 1 (Land Use – Community Conservation and Protection) Goal LU-5.1 A physical environment where degraded riparian areas have been restored and the natural topography retained:</p> <p><b>Consistent:</b> The Gopher Canyon Road Alternative site is not located within a blue line or other riparian area. The engineered slopes of the landfill would change the natural landform character of the area. However, mitigation, including revegetation with native species and grading to create mounded forms that conform to the shapes of the existing hillsides and reduce the angularity of the landfill that would, contrast to a greater degree, would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The landfill prism would not rise above existing ridgelines or significantly impact views in the area.</p>	<p>(A. Scenic Preservation) Preserve, to the extent possible, the scenic attributes of the I-15 corridor:</p> <p><b>Not Consistent.</b> As previously discussed, the landfill prism would cause a significant impact to natural landform character with respect to contrast with the surrounding mountains and domination of the ridgeline as viewed from I-15. Impacts to other scenic resources, including vegetation and trees and visual quality of the area would be reduced to a less than significant level through the implementation of mitigation measures, including replanting the area with native species, planted groups of mature trees, reuse of boulders, use of contoured grading and mounded grading the fits the character of natural hillsides, painting of facilities to match the natural background color and texture, and other measures. However, because impacts to natural landform character cannot be reduced to a less than significant level, the Merriam Mountain Alternative would not be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>Chapter 1.E. Coordination: This goal is to coordinate East Otay and Mesa de Otay (Mexico) planning and development. According to the Subregional Plan, the County will discourage industries that display pollution or other nuisance characteristics from locating near the Mexican border. The Plan states that the County will encourage any development or proposals for the Otay Mesa Area to consider the consequences of such proposals on development across the border. All development proposals shall be distributed to appropriate Mexican officials for review and comment.</p> <p><b>Partially Consistent.</b> The alternative is sited near the international border with Mexico and would be visible from viewing locations in Mexico, including residential neighborhoods within about 1/2 mile of the landfill site. As such, the visual impact (as viewed from south of the border) may be considered a “nuisance characteristic” [see KTU+A, East Otay Mesa Visual Impact Assessment Technical Report, page 6 (May 2012), Appendix D of the EIS]. Because the alternative would result in a nuisance with respect to aesthetics, it would not be fully consistent with this objective of the Subregional Plan. While the alternative would represent a nuisance characteristic within the proximity (¼ of the international border, the alternative would incorporate control measures, such as litter, dust and odor control plans, to ensure that it would not generate other industrial nuisance features.</p>

TABLE 2 - COMPARISON OF THE APPLICABLE POLICIES OF COMMUNITY PLANS/SUBREGIONAL PLANS (CONTINUED)

APPLICANT’S PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE	ASPEN ROAD ALTERNATIVE	GOPHER CANYON ROAD ALTERNATIVE	MERRIAM MOUNTAIN ALTERNATIVE	EAST OTAY MESA ALTERNATIVE
Pala Pauma Subregional Plan	Fallbrook Community Plan	Bonsall Community Plan	North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan	Otay Subregional Plan
<p>Chapter 1 (Land Use) Policy B.5. Designate existing agricultural areas under the rural lands regional category, when consistent with parcel sized, to limit the intrusion of incompatible land uses into existing agricultural areas:</p> <p><b>Not Applicable:</b> The Applicant’s Proposed Alternative is not an existing agricultural land use and, as such, this policy would not be applicable.</p>		<p>Chapter 1 (Land Use – Community Conservation and Protection) Goal LU-5.2 The preservation of groundwater resources, community character and protection of sensitive resources in the Bonsall Community Planning Area:</p> <p><b>Consistent.</b> Municipal water would be available to supply the alternative’s water needs and, thus, withdrawal of groundwater would not be required. Design features and mitigation measures, including the enforcement of BMP’s under the alternative’s SWPPP and SUSMP would ensure the protection of ground and surface waters. Under the SUSMP, all storm water would be retained and filtered before it leaves the site. The landfill would be lined with an impervious single composite liner. Runoff would be collected in perimeter channels and directed to sedimentation basins prior to entering the groundwater. Capturing runoff would prevent erosion, scouring, or other harm to downstream areas and would protect downstream biological resources.</p>	<p>Land Use) Provide a land use pattern sensitive to the opportunities and constraints of the I-15 corridor:</p> <p><b>Not Consistent.</b> The Merriam Mountain Alternative would not be consistent with the underlying Rural Lands (RL-20) land use designation and zoning on the property. As such, Merriam Mountain Alternative would not be consistent with the intended land use patterns established for the area.</p>	
<p>Chapter 2 (Commercial): Not Applicable</p>	<p>Chapter 3 (Conservation and Open Space – Agricultural Soils and Production) Goal COS 1.1. Agriculture and agriculturally-oriented services that promote agriculture as an important component in the economic base of Fallbrook:</p> <p><b>Not Consistent.</b> The Aspen Road Alternative would adversely impact areas that are designated as Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, and a designated Agricultural Conservation tract, all located within the Aspen Road property.</p>	<p>Chapter 1 (Land Use – Community Facilities) Goal LU-6.1 Infrastructure and public utilities that are provided concurrent to development in a manner compatible with community character while minimizing visual and environmental impacts:</p> <p><b>Not Applicable:</b> “Community Facilities” applies explicitly to telecommunications facilities.</p>	<p>Land Use) Provide a land use pattern sensitive to the opportunities and constraints of the I-15 corridor:</p> <p><b>Not Consistent.</b> The Merriam Mountain Alternative would not be consistent with the underlying Rural Lands (RL-20) land use designation and zoning on the property. As such, Merriam Mountain Alternative would not be consistent with the intended land use patterns established for the area.</p>	
<p>Chapter 3 (Public Services and Facilities) Policy A. Public Services and facilities are provided in a planned and orderly fashion and they are phased in five-year increments in response to evolving and changing market demands:</p> <p><b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies explicitly to sewer and water services and would not be applicable to the Applicant’s Proposed Alternative.</p>	<p>Chapter 3 (Conservation and Open Space – Plant and Animal Habitats and Wildlife Corridors) Goal COS 1.2 Community Forests. Preservation and enhancement of urban and rural trees in our community for their beauty and for the health benefits that they provide:</p> <p><b>Consistent.</b> Trees and other vegetation removed for the development of the landfill would be replaced through a revegetation program that requires the replacement of native plant species and the planting or maintenance of groups of mature trees.</p>	<p>Chapter 1 (Land Use – Water Supply, Wastewater, and Solid Waste) Goal LU-7.2 Bonsall’s solid waste disposal needs are met on a timely basis with the least possible impact on the environment:</p> <p><b>Consistent:</b> The location of the Gopher Canyon Road property in the north County would allow closer access to the Bonsall community and would reduce mileage compared to trucking to existing landfills in other areas of the county. A reduction in mileage would result in a respective reduction in vehicle emissions.</p>	<p>Conservation Areas) The Resource Conservation Area (RCA) designation is applied to protect sensitive biological, archaeological, aesthetic, mineral, and water resources:</p> <p><b>Not Consistent.</b> As previously discussed, impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, and ground and surface water resources would be reduced to a less than significant level through the implementation of mitigation measures described in Sections 4.4, Biological Resources; 4.5 Cultural Resources; 4.9, Hydrogeological Resources; and 4.14, Surface Hydrology of the EIS, respectively. However, the landfill would significantly impact natural landform character because of contrast with the surrounding mountains, alteration of an important view corridor, and domination of the</p>	

TABLE 2 - COMPARISON OF THE APPLICABLE POLICIES OF COMMUNITY PLANS/SUBREGIONAL PLANS (CONTINUED)

APPLICANT’S PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE	ASPEN ROAD ALTERNATIVE	GOPHER CANYON ROAD ALTERNATIVE	MERRIAM MOUNTAIN ALTERNATIVE	EAST OTAY MESA ALTERNATIVE
Pala Pauma Subregional Plan	Fallbrook Community Plan	Bonsall Community Plan	North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan	Otay Subregional Plan
			ridgeline as viewed from I-15. The alternative could affect access to the currently mined granite resources in the area, which would be considered a potentially significant impact on the availability of mineral resources. Because these impacts would not be reduced to less than significant levels, the alternative would not be consistent with this policy	
<p>Chapter 4 (Mobility) A. It is necessary to plan for the orderly development of a highway and street network adequate to handle subregional traffic at acceptable service levels and capable of accommodating automobile and truck traffic as well as public modes of travel in the subregion:</p> <p><b>Consistent.</b> The Applicant’s Proposed Alternative would increase traffic on SR 76 by up to 673 truck trips per day. With the implementation of mitigation measures, which include the addition of deceleration and acceleration lanes and a signal at SR 76 and the access road, traffic impacts would not be significant.</p>	<p>Chapter 3 (Conservation and Open Space - Surface, Groundwater, and Watersheds) Goal COS 1.3 Water Resources. To preserve viable streams, wetlands, and floodplains and support the natural environment for the citizens of Fallbrook:</p> <p><b>Consistent.</b> A USGS designated blue line drainage, a tributary of Rainbow Creek, flows toward the southwest in the southern portion of the Aspen Road Alternative site. Rainbow Creek runs through the southern portion of the site. The southern desilting basin and ancillary facilities would be located in the proximity of the tributary and Rainbow Creek. Water quality control measures, including compliance with applicable regulations would protect these resources from adverse impacts. Incorporated design features include the implementation of the minimum required five-foot separation between groundwater and waste, installation of a composite liner in compliance with the design standards for Class III solid waste sites as specified in 40 CFR, 258.40 and subdrain system below the liner and a leachate collection and removal system (LCRS) over the synthetic liner. A 60-foot high engineered fill berm would be located at the lower end of the landfill prism to increase stability and to reduce earthwork activities in the blue line drainage.</p>	<p>Chapter 2 (Circulation and Mobility – Integrated Mobility and Access) Goal CM-1.1 A Circulation system which preserves the rural character of the community and provides a safe, balanced transportation system, which includes automobile, bicycle, equestrian and pedestrian users:</p> <p><b>Not Consistent.</b> The addition of up to 673 trucks a day on Gopher Canyon Road and along a new roadway along the Valley View Country Club property would affect the rural character of the roadway.</p>		
<p>Chapter 4 (Mobility) B. The Mobility Element road classifications are to be applied to roads according to their carrying capacity based on traffic forecasts and public road standards, except for those where a failing level of service is deemed acceptable by the County when any criteria specifically identified in the Mobility Element Table M-3 is met:</p> <p><b>Consistent.</b> The Community Plan recognizes the following: “ the use of SR-76 for recreational-oriented travelers will continue to impact the local and regional road and</p>	<p>Chapter 3 (Conservation and Open Space) Policy COS 1.4.2 Require any landfill and solid waste management facilities proposed in the subregional group area to comply with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Provide justification demonstrating that additional landfill capacity is necessary per County Integrated Waste Management Plan requirements; and</li><li>- Ensure that all solid waste management facilities are evaluated under all applicable siting criteria.</li></ul>	<p>Chapter 3 (Conservation and Open Space – Resource Conservation and Management) Goal COS-1.1 The preservation of the unique natural and cultural resources of Bonsall and the San Luis Rey River and associated watershed, with continued support for its traditional rural and agricultural life-style:</p> <p><b>Consistent:</b> Mitigation measures incorporated in to the EIS to reduce impacts to natural and cultural resources, including replanting degraded areas with native plant species, water quality protection, and preservation of cultural resources, would reduce impacts to the property’s scenic, biological,</p>		

TABLE 2 - COMPARISON OF THE APPLICABLE POLICIES OF COMMUNITY PLANS/SUBREGIONAL PLANS (CONTINUED)

APPLICANT’S PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE	ASPEN ROAD ALTERNATIVE	GOPHER CANYON ROAD ALTERNATIVE	MERRIAM MOUNTAIN ALTERNATIVE	EAST OTAY MESA ALTERNATIVE
Pala Pauma Subregional Plan	Fallbrook Community Plan	Bonsall Community Plan	North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan	Otay Subregional Plan
highway network.” The cumulative traffic impact analysis for the alternative takes into consideration future expansion of the Pala Casino and other related projects in the area. With the implementation of recommended roadway improvements under the alternative, cumulative impacts at the buildout of the alternative and related projects, are determined to be less than significant. Therefore, the Applicant’s Proposed Alternative would be consistent with the mobility goals of the Community Plan, the purpose of which is to maintain acceptable carrying capacity of the street network.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> The Aspen Road Alternative site was one of three landfill sites evaluated in the 1990 Draft EIS/EIS for the North County Class III Landfill (BRG, 1990). It is designated as a tentative Class III landfill site in the County’s Integrated Waste Management Plan (1996). However, the property was removed from the Siting Element in the County’s 2005 Update of the Siting Element since the General Plan and zoning for the site had not been amended to allow the development of a landfill.	and cultural resources and off-site water courses to a less than significant level (please refer to Sections 4.1, Aesthetics, 4.4, Biological Resources, 4.5 Cultural Resources, 4.9, Hydrogeology, and 4.14, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS). No river, tributary or blue line stream transects the property.		
Chapter5 (Conservation) A. It is necessary to protect the environmental resources designated as “Resource Conservation Areas.”  <b>Not Consistent.</b> (Please refer to the prior discussion under Policy B.4 and the following discussion under “Appendix A.”)	Chapter 3 (Conservation and Open Space – Air Quality) Goal COS 1.5 Land use plans and policies that protect and improve the air quality of the Fallbrook community:  <b>Consistent:</b> As described in Section 4.3, Air Quality, and GHG Emissions, of the EIS, the alternative would include design features and mitigation measures that would minimize air emissions and local greenhouse gases. In addition, the location of the Aspen Road property in the North County would allow closer access to North County’s population centers and would reduce mileage compared to trucking to existing landfills in other areas of the county. A reduction in mileage would result in a respective reduction in vehicle emissions.	Chapter 3 (Conservation and Open Space –Plant and Animal Habitats and Wildlife Corridors)  Goal COS-1.3. Naturally vegetated open space corridors of sufficient size to maintain biological diversity and functional access for wildlife between varying habitats and to prevent fragmentation of habitats and the creation of biological “islands:”  <b>Consistent:</b> Measures to mitigation impacts to biological resources, including restoration and preservation of open space on the unused portion of the property, which generally encircles the landfill site, would restore native plant species and provide wildlife corridors to any contiguous, undeveloped land.		
Appendix A - Resource Conservation Areas for Pala/Pauma ( RCA # 15 Mount Gregory) Resources in this steep rocky area include large old growth mixed chaparral which serves as wildlife habitat and oak woodlands in canyon bottoms, and north facing slopes:  <b>Consistent:</b> The Gregory Mountain RCA encompasses the entire east and west slopes and the crest of the mountain. The landfill would be located within the canyon at the west side of Gregory Mountain and would maintain a gap of at least 700 feet above the top of the landfill and the crest of Gregory Mountain would be maintained. The landfill would adversely impact biotic resources within the canyon at the west flank of Gregory Mountain and, as such, would not be consistent with the purpose of the RCA to		Chapter 3 (Conservation and Open Space - Scenic Resources) Goal COS-1.4 An “astronomical dark sky” that retains the rural setting and facilitates the astronomical research in San Diego County and the continued operation of the Mt. Palomar observatory:  <b>Consistent.</b> The operation of the landfill would take place during daytime hours and would not require flood lighting or spot lighting during the evening or nighttime hours. All on-site lighting would be directed downward for wayfinding and security purposes and would not be a significant source of light. Lighting would be consistent with the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (Sections 59.108–59.110), which is intended to reduce light pollution at the County’s observatories. Directed lighting for security and wayfinding would consistent with Code		

TABLE 2 - COMPARISON OF THE APPLICABLE POLICIES OF COMMUNITY PLANS/SUBREGIONAL PLANS (CONTINUED)

APPLICANT’S PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE	ASPEN ROAD ALTERNATIVE	GOPHER CANYON ROAD ALTERNATIVE	MERRIAM MOUNTAIN ALTERNATIVE	EAST OTAY MESA ALTERNATIVE
Pala Pauma Subregional Plan	Fallbrook Community Plan	Bonsall Community Plan	North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan	Otay Subregional Plan
conserve biotic resources. The HRRMP, described in detail in Section 4.4, Biological Resources, of the EIS would replace coastal sage scrub/chaparral vegetation communities at a 2:1 ratio by the preservation of 19.0 acres of coastal sage scrub in dedicated open space on the landfill site; coast live oak woodland would be replaced at a 2:1 ratio by the off-site acquisition of 1.6 acres of existing coast live oak woodland of like quality. If possible, individual oak trees would be salvaged from the impact area and transplanted to appropriate open space habitat on the landfill site. Upon closure, the landfill prism would be replanted (revegetated) with native plant species and maintained as permanent open space. With the implementation of biological resources design features (including the HRRMP), impacts with respect to this land use classification would be less than significant (please refer to Section 4.4, Biological Resources, of the EIS.		requirements would reduce glare and would not increase ambient lighting in the area and region.		
<hr/> <div>Source: PCR Services Corporation, 2012</div>				

TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE

Goal/Policy	Applicant’s Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Alternative
<b>Chapter 3 Land Use Element</b>					
GOAL LU-1: Primacy of the Land Use Element. A land use plan and development doctrine that sustain the intent and integrity of the Community Development Model and the boundaries between Regional Categories.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward County planners and decision makers. However, this alternative is consistent with the designated land use for this site and would, therefore, support this goal of the General Plan.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal would not be applicable to the Aspen Road Alternative. However, this alternative would not consistent with the designated land use for the site and would, therefore, not support this goal of the General Plan.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal would not be applicable to the Gopher Canyon Road Alternative. However, this alternative would not consistent with the designated land use for the site and would, therefore, not support this goal of the General Plan.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal would not be applicable to the Merriam Mountain Alternative. However, this alternative would not consistent with the designated land use for the site and would, therefore, not support this goal of the General Plan.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward County planners and decision makers. However, the East Otay Mesa alternative is consistent with the designated land use for this site and would, therefore, support this goal of the General Plan.
Policy LU-1.1 - Assigning Land Use Designations. Assign land use designations on the Land Use Map in accordance with the Community Development Model and boundaries established by the Regional Categories Map.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward County planners and decision makers. However, the alternative would be consistent with the designated land use for this site and would, therefore, support this policy of the General Plan. The “Solid Waste Facility” designation of this site reflects the San Diego County Proposition C, passed in 1994.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal would not be applicable to the Aspen Road Alternative. However, this alternative would not be consistent with the designations on the Land Use Map prepared by County planners and decision-makers.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal would not be applicable to the Gopher Canyon Road Alternative. However, this alternative would not be consistent with the designations on the Land Use Map prepared by County planners and decision-makers.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal would not be applicable to the Merriam Mountain Alternative. However, this alternative would not be consistent with the designations on the Land Use Map prepared by County planners and decision-makers.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward County planners and decision makers. However, this alternative is consistent with the designated land use for this site and would, therefore, support this goal of the General Plan.
Policies LU-1.2 through LU-1.5 apply to leapfrog development (Villages located away from established Villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries), village expansion, community development patterns, Relationship of County land use designations with adjoining jurisdictions (which are to prohibit the use of established or planned land use patterns in nearby or adjacent jurisdictions as the primary precedent or justification for adjusting land use designations of unincorporated County lands).	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located within a proposed “Village” nor would it create a “Village.” In addition, this alternative is not located along the County boundary and would not alter density based on adjoining jurisdictions. However, this alternative would provide solid waste disposal infrastructure that would support community development envisioned under the General Plan.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located within a proposed “Village” nor or would it create a “Village.” Although the Aspen Road site is located in the proximity to the County boundary, it would not alter density based on adjoining jurisdictions.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located within a “Village” nor would it create a “Village.” In addition, this alternative is not located along the County boundary and would not alter density based on adjoining jurisdictions.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located within a “Village” nor would it create a “Village.” In addition, this alternative is not located along the County boundary and would not alter density based on adjoining jurisdictions.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located within a “Village” nor would it create a “Village.” In addition, this alternative is not located along the County boundary and would not alter density based on adjoining jurisdictions.
LU-1.6 Conversion of Public Lands to Private Ownership. Assign lands in public use an underlying designation of Rural Lands 80. When such lands are transferred to private ownership, the RL-80 designation shall apply until the appropriate long-term use of the property is determined and a general plan amendment is approved for redesignation of the property. This policy applies to areas on the Land Use Map designated Public/Semi-Public Facilities, Federal and State Lands, and Tribal Lands.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The Gregory Canyon property is under private ownership and, thus, is not a public property that would be converted to a private ownership.	<b>Not Applicable:</b> The Aspen Road property is privately owned and, thus, is not a public property that would be converted to a private ownership.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The Gopher Canyon Road property is privately owned and, thus, is not a public property that would be converted to a private ownership.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The Merriam Mountain property is privately owned and, thus, is not a public property that would be converted to a private ownership.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The East Otay Mesa property is privately owned and, thus, is not a public property that would be converted to a private ownership.

**TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Alternative</b>
Policies LU-1.7 through LU-1.9 apply to residential densities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not have a residential component or other component related to urban or residential density.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not have a residential component or other component related to urban or residential density.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not have a residential component or other component related to urban or residential density.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not have a residential component or other component related to urban or residential density.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not have a residential component or other component related to urban or residential density.
Policy LU-2.1 Community Plans. Maintain updated Community Plans, as part of the General Plan, to guide development to reflect the character and vision for each individual unincorporated community, consistent with the General Plan.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward County planners. However, the alternative would be consistent with the designated land use for this site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward County planners. However, the alternative would not be consistent with the designated land use for this site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward County planners. However, the alternative would not be consistent with the designated land use for this site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward County planners. However, the alternative would not be consistent with the designated land use for this site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward County planners. However, the alternative would not be consistent with the designated land use for this site.
Policy LU-2.2 Relationship of Community Plans to the General Plan. Community Plans are part of the General Plan. These plans focus on a particular region or community within the overall General Plan area. They are meant to refine the policies of the General Plan as they apply to a smaller geographic region and provide a forum for resolving local conflicts. As legally required by State law, Community Plans must be internally consistent with General Plan goals and policies of which they are a part. They cannot undermine the policies of the General Plan. Community Plans are subject to adoption, review and amendment by the Board of Supervisors in the same manner as the General Plan.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal applies to the Community Plans as components of the General Plan. However, the alternative would be consistent with the designated land use for this site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal applies to the Community Plans as components of the General Plan. However, the alternative would not be consistent with the designated land use for this site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal applies to the Community Plans as components of the General Plan. However, the alternative would not be consistent with the designated land use for this site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal applies to the Community Plans as components of the General Plan. However, the alternative would not be consistent with the designated land use for this site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal applies to the Community Plans as components of the General Plan. However, the alternative would be consistent with the designated land use for this site.
Policy LU-2.3 Development Densities and Lot Sizes. Assign densities and minimum lot sizes in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is designated for a solid waste facility would not involve a subdivision or creation of lots or residential density. .	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would be a solid waste facility and would not involve a subdivision or creation of lots or residential density.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would be a solid waste facility and would not involve a subdivision or creation of lots or residential density.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would be a solid waste facility and would not involve a subdivision or creation of lots or residential density.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would be a solid waste facility and would not involve a subdivision or creation of lots or residential density.
Policy LU-2.5 Greenbelts to Define Communities. Identify and maintain greenbelts between communities to reinforce the identity of individual communities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Greenbelt criteria create visual relief between developed areas (villages, subdivisions, and commercial districts). Greenbelts are generally broad areas of public open space, or commonly own open space in a large subdivision and would not be applicable to an individual site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Greenbelts are generally broad areas of public open space, or commonly own open space in a large subdivision and would not be applicable to an individual site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Greenbelts are generally broad areas of public open space, or commonly own open space in a large subdivision and would not be applicable to an individual site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Greenbelts are generally broad areas of public open space, or commonly own open space in a large subdivision and would not be applicable to an individual site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Greenbelts are generally broad areas of public open space, or commonly own open space in a large subdivision and would not be applicable to an individual site.
Policy LU-2.7 Commercial Viability. Ensure that new commercial centers maintain or enhance the viability of existing commercial areas.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy addresses commercial developments; this alternative is a landfill on a site designated for a Solid Waste Facility. Thus, this policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy addresses commercial developments; the site is designated as rural and semi-rural lands; thus, this policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy addresses commercial developments; the site designated as primarily rural and semi-rural lands; thus, this policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy addresses commercial developments; the site is designated as rural lands. Thus, this policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy addresses commercial developments; the site is designated as rural lands. Thus, this policy does not apply.

**TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Alternative</b>
GOAL LU-3 and Policies LU-3.1 through LU-3.3 apply to residential neighborhoods and mix of housing units.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is the development of a solid waste facility and does not include a residential component. Thus, this goal and associated policies do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is the development of a solid waste facility and does not include a residential component. Thus, this goal and associated policies do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is the development of a solid waste facility and does not include a residential component. Thus, this goal and associated policies do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is the development of a solid waste facility and does not include a residential component. Thus, this goal and associated policies do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is the development of a solid waste facility and does not include a residential component. Thus, this goal and associated policies do not apply.
GOAL LU-4 and Policies LU-4.1 through LU-4-7 apply to inter-jurisdictional coordination, regional planning, review of impacts, coordination with the plans and activities of other agencies and tribal governments, development compatibility with military facilities, annexations, planning for energy facilities, and airport compatibility plans.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are toward County policy and the County's approach to governmental issues and are not intended to address individual projects. However, this alternative includes Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act to address impacts to Native American resources through a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Applicant and the appropriate regulatory agencies.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are toward County policy and the County's approach to governmental issues and are not intended to address individual projects.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are toward County policy and the County's approach to governmental issues and are not intended to address individual projects.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are toward County policy and the County's approach to governmental issues and are not intended to address individual projects.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are toward County policy and the County's approach to governmental issues and are not intended to address individual projects.
Policy LU-5.1 Reduction of Vehicle Trips within Communities. Incorporate a mixture of uses within Villages and Rural Villages and plan residential densities at a level that support multi-modal transportation, including walking, bicycling, and the use of public transit, when appropriate.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward multi-modal transportation to serve residential development and is not applicable to a landfill alternative. However, this alternative would serve the solid waste needs of populated areas in the north County and, as such, reduce regional vehicle miles to more distant sites in the County.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward multi-modal transportation to serve residential development and is not applicable to a landfill alternative. However, this alternative would serve the solid waste needs of populated areas in the north County and, as such, reduce regional vehicle miles to more distant sites in the County.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward multi-modal transportation to serve residential development and is not applicable to a landfill alternative. However, this alternative would serve the solid waste needs of populated areas in the north County and, as such, reduce regional vehicle miles to more distant sites in the County.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward multi-modal transportation to serve residential development and is not applicable to a landfill alternative. However, this alternative would serve the solid waste needs of populated areas in the north County and, as such, reduce regional vehicle miles to more distant sites in the County.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward multi-modal transportation to serve residential development and is not applicable to a landfill alternative. However, this alternative would serve the solid waste needs of populated areas in the north County and, as such, would increase regional vehicle miles compared to other alternatives.
Policy LU-5.4 Planning Support. Undertake planning efforts that promote infill and redevelopment of uses that accommodate walking and biking within communities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the promotion of infill and other urban planning efforts. The alternative would provide infrastructure for solid waste disposal and is not related to land development for expansion of communities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the promotion of infill and other urban planning efforts. The alternative would provide infrastructure for solid waste disposal and is not related to land development for expansion of communities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the promotion of infill and other urban planning efforts. The alternative would provide infrastructure for solid waste disposal and is not related to land development for expansion of communities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the promotion of infill and other urban planning efforts. The alternative would provide infrastructure for solid waste disposal and is not related to land development for expansion of communities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the promotion of infill and other urban planning efforts. The alternative would provide infrastructure for solid waste disposal and is not related to land development for expansion of communities.



**TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Alternative</b>
Policy LU-6.2 Reducing Development Pressures. Assign lowest-density or lowest-intensity land use designations to areas with sensitive natural resources.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners and applies to assignment of land use designations. However, to reduce impacts to sensitive natural resources, the alternative would include a large open space component consistent with lower density land uses in the area and would provide for habitat preservation; restoration and enhancement of sensitive vegetation communities; and either acquisition of, or in lieu fees for the acquisition of, permanent offsite open space supporting sensitive plant species, which would be consistent with the intent of this policy to protect sensitive natural resources.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners and applies to assignment of land use designations applied by the County. However, at the end of the landfill life, the land would be maintained as permanent open space consistent with lower density land uses in the area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners and applies to assignment of land use designations applied by the County. However, at the end of the landfill life, the land would be maintained as permanent open space, consistent with lower density land uses in the area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners and applies to assignment of land use designations applied by the County. However, at the end of the landfill life, the land would be maintained as permanent open space, consistent with lower density land uses in the area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners and applies to assignment of land use designations applied by the County. However, at the end of the landfill life, the land would be maintained as permanent open space
Policy LU-6.3 Conservation-Oriented Design. Support conservation-oriented alternative design. This can be achieved with mechanisms such as, but not limited to, Specific Plans, lot area averaging, and reductions in lot size with corresponding requirements for preserved open space (Planned Residential Developments). Projects that rely on lot size reductions should incorporate specific design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, or buffers, to achieve compatibility with community character.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners to provide for lot averaging that would support conservation in subdivisions and specific plan areas. Although not specifically applicable to the alternative (which is not a land division or specific plan), this alternative would include a large open space component and would provide for habitat preservation, consistent with the intent of this policy.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners to provide for lot averaging that would support conservation in subdivisions and specific plan areas.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners to provide for lot averaging that would support conservation in subdivisions and specific plan areas.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners to provide for lot averaging that would support conservation in subdivisions and specific plan areas.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners to provide for lot averaging that would support conservation in subdivisions and specific plan areas.
Policy LU-6.4 Sustainable Subdivision Design. Require that residential subdivisions be planned to conserve open space and natural resources, protect agricultural operations including grazing, increase fire safety and defensibility, reduce impervious footprints, use sustainable development practices, and, when appropriate, provide public amenities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not involve a subdivision or other residential component.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not involve a subdivision or other residential component.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not involve a subdivision or other residential component.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not involve a subdivision or other residential component.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not involve a subdivision or other residential component.

**TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant’s Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Alternative</b>
Policy LU-6.12 Flooding. Document and annually review areas within floodways and 100- and 200-year floodplains to ensure areas subject to flooding are accurately mapped in accordance with AB 162 (enacted January 1, 2008).	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners and requires the County to review areas in floodways and floodplains to ensure accurate mapping. Only the bridge and a section of the access road would be located within the floodplain. No habitable structures would be located in the floodplain. Although in proximity to the San Luis Rey River, components of the alternative, including the landfill and borrow/stockpile sites would be located outside the 100- or 200-year floodplain (see Section 3.15, Surface Hydrology, of the EIS) and would not impede the intent of this policy to protect the public from flood hazards.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners and requires the County to review areas in floodways and floodplains to ensure accurate mapping. However, the Aspen Road site is not located within a designated floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners and requires the County to review areas in floodways and floodplains to ensure accurate mapping. However, the Gopher Canyon Road site is not located within a designated floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners and requires the County to review areas in floodways and floodplains to ensure accurate mapping. However, the Merriam Mountain site is not located within a designated floodplain.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward County planners and requires the County to review areas in floodways and floodplains to ensure accurate mapping. However, the Merriam Mountain site is not located within a designated floodplain.
Policy LU-8.4 Program for Borrego Valley Aquifer. Support the Borrego Valley Water District with their program to slow the overdrafting and extend the life of the aquifer supporting the residents of the Borrego Valley.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within the Borrego Valley Aquifer. Thus, this policy is not applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within the Borrego Valley Aquifer. Thus, this policy is not applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within the Borrego Valley Aquifer. Thus, this policy is not applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within the Borrego Valley Aquifer. Thus, this policy is not applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within the Borrego Valley Aquifer. Thus, this policy is not applicable.
Goal LU-9 “Distinct Villages and Community Cores. Well-defined, well-planned, and well-developed community cores, such as Villages and Town Centers, that contribute to a community’s identity and character,” and Policies LU-9.1 through LU 9.12 apply to village and community core planning, residential density, village guidelines, streets and facilities serving villages, distinct areas within communities, town center uses, transportation nodes, residential development patterns, internal village connectivity, planned densities, and integration of natural features.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policies apply to village and town centers. The site is designated as Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility) and does not include an urban or residential component, such as a community core, village, or town center.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policies apply to village and town centers. The site is designated as Rural Lands (RL20), Rural Lands (RL-40) and Semi-Rural Lands (SR-2) and does not include a community core, village, or town center component.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policies apply to village and town centers. The site is designated as Specific Plan Area, Rural Lands (RL20), Semi-Rural Residential, (SR-4), and Public Agency Lands (Extractive /Industry and does not include a community core, village, or town center component.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policies apply to village and town centers. The site is designated as is designated as Rural Lands (RL-20) and does not include a community core, village, or town center component.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policies apply to village and town centers. The site is designated as Public/Semi-Public Land (Solid Waste Facility) and does not include an urban or residential component, such as a community core, village, or town center.
GOAL LU-14 and Policies LU-14.1 through LU-14.5 apply to wastewater facilities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative comprises a solid waste facility and does not include wastewater treatment or conveyance components.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative comprises a solid waste facility and does not include wastewater treatment or conveyance components.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative comprises a solid waste facility and does not include wastewater treatment or conveyance components.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative comprises a solid waste facility and does not include wastewater treatment or conveyance components.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative comprises a solid waste facility and does not include wastewater treatment or conveyance components.
GOAL LU-15 and Policies LU-15.1 and LU-15.2 specifically apply to wireless communication.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is the development, operation, and closure of a solid waste facility and does not include wireless communication components.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is the development, operation, and closure of a solid waste facility and does not include wireless communication components.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is the development, operation, and closure of a solid waste facility and does not include wireless communication components.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is the development, operation, and closure of a solid waste facility and does not include wireless communication components.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is the development, operation, and closure of a solid waste facility and does not include wireless communication components.

**TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)**

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Alternative
<b>Chapter 4- Mobility Element</b>					
GOAL M-1 and Policies M-1.1 through M-1-3 apply to the development of a roadway network and treatment of high volume roadways.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward the County regarding the provision of public roads and the reduction of secondary impacts associated with high volume roads. Although the alternative does not contain any street or highway development components, it would realign SR 76 and add turning lanes to improve site access. However, the goal and policies are directed toward the adequacy of a County-wide network.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward the County regarding the provision of public roads throughout the County.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward the County regarding the provision of public roads throughout the County.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward the County regarding the provision of public roads throughout the County.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward the County regarding the provision of public roads throughout the County.
GOAL M-5, Safe and Efficient Multi-Modal Transportation System. A multi-modal transportation system that provides for the safe, accessible, convenient, and efficient movement of people and goods within the unincorporated County and Policies M-5.1 and M-5.2 apply to multi-modal transportation systems.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and refer to local and regional transportation systems under the County's jurisdiction and are not applicable to development projects.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and refer to local and regional transportation systems under the County's jurisdiction and are not applicable to development projects.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and refer to local and regional transportation systems under the County's jurisdiction and are not applicable to development projects.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and refer to local and regional transportation systems under the County's jurisdiction and are not applicable to development projects.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and refer to local and regional transportation systems under the County's jurisdiction and are not applicable to development projects.
GOAL M-6 Efficient Freight Service Linked to Other Transportation Modes. Freight services that efficiently move goods and that are effectively linked to other transportation modes.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward the County and refers to regional freight systems and is not applicable to development projects.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward the County and refers to regional freight systems and is not applicable to development projects.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward the County and refers to regional freight systems and is not applicable to development projects.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward the County and refers to regional freight systems and is not applicable to development projects.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal is directed toward the County and refers to regional freight systems and is not applicable to development projects.
Policy M-6.1 Designated Truck Routes. Minimize heavy truck traffic (generally more than 33,000 pounds and mostly used for long-haul purposes) near schools and within Villages and Residential Neighborhoods by designating official truck routes, establishing incompatible weight limits on roads unintended for frequent truck traffic, and carefully locating truck-intensive land uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> SR 76 is not a designated truck route, as this term applies to urban areas.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Rainbow Glen Road is not a designated truck route, as this term applies to urban areas.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Gopher Canyon Road is not a designated truck route, as this term applies to urban areas.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Champagne Boulevard and Lawrence Welk Drive are not designated truck routes, as this term applies to urban areas.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Otay Mesa Road, SR 125 and other access roads in the area are not designated truck routes, as this term applies to urban areas.
Policies M-6.2 through M-6.5 apply to rail lines, transit, and adaptive reuse of abandoned rail lines.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not have a rail component or use rail for waste hauling.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not have a rail component or use rail for waste hauling.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not have a rail component or use rail for waste hauling.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not have a rail component or use rail for waste hauling.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not have a rail component or use rail for waste hauling.
GOAL M-7, to provide viable and accessible airport facilities whose continuing operations effectively serve the evolving needs of the region while minimizing any adverse impacts of airport operations, and Policy M-7.1 apply specifically to airport facilities and meeting airport needs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy is directed toward the County regarding the provision of airport services. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply to the alternative, which has no air component airfreight demand.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy is directed toward the County regarding the provision of airport services. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply to the alternative, which has no air component airfreight demand.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy is directed toward the County regarding the provision of airport services. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply to the alternative, which has no air component airfreight demand.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy is directed toward the County regarding the provision of airport services. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply to the alternative, which has no air component airfreight demand.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy is directed toward the County regarding the provision of airport services. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply to the alternative, which has no air component airfreight demand.

**TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Alternative</b>
GOAL M-8, to provide public transit system that reduces automobile dependence and serves all segments of the population, and Policies M-8.1 through M-8.8 apply specifically to public transit systems.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to regional transit systems. Thus, the goal and policies do not apply to the alternative.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to regional transit systems. Thus, the goal and policies do not apply to the alternative.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to regional transit systems. Thus, the goal and policies do not apply to the alternative.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to regional transit systems. Thus, the goal and policies do not apply to the alternative.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to regional transit systems. Thus, the goal and policies do not apply to the alternative.
GOAL M-9, to reduce the need to widen or build roads through effective use of the existing transportation network and maximizing the use of alternative modes of travel throughout the County, and Policies M-9.1 through M-9.4 apply to County-wide transportation networks (to maximize alternative modes of travel), transportation systems management, transportation demand management, preferred parking, and park and ride facilities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to regional transportation management. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply to the alternative.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to regional transportation management. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply to the alternative.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to regional transportation management. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply to the alternative.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to regional transportation management. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply to the alternative.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to regional transportation management. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply to the alternative.
GOAL M-10, to reduce the need to widen or build roads through effective use of the existing transportation network and maximizing the use of alternative modes of travel throughout the County and Policies M-10.1 through M-10.6 apply specifically to motor vehicle parking, parking demand, and design of parking facilities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to motor vehicle parking. The alternative is not located in an urban setting and would not generate a parking demand within an urban context.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to motor vehicle parking. The alternative is not located in an urban setting and would not generate a parking demand within an urban context.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to motor vehicle parking. The alternative is not located in an urban setting and would not generate a parking demand within an urban context.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to motor vehicle parking. The alternative is not located in an urban setting and would not generate a parking demand within an urban context.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to motor vehicle parking. The alternative is not located in an urban setting and would not generate a parking demand within an urban context.
GOAL M-11, to provide bicycle and pedestrian networks and facilities that provide safe, efficient, and attractive mobility options as well as recreational opportunities for County residents, and Policies M-11.1 through M-11.7 apply to bicycle and pedestrian facilities, design and location of facilities, bike paths on designated roadways, network connectivity, funding for bicycle improvements, and coordination with the County Trails Program.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and encourage bicycle and pedestrian modes as alternative transportation within an urban context. The alternative would provide infrastructure and as such is not urban in character. The alternative would not generate population. Therefore, this goal and policies do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and encourage bicycle and pedestrian modes as alternative transportation within an urban context. The alternative would provide infrastructure and as such is not urban in character. The alternative would not generate population. Therefore, this goal and policies do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and encourage bicycle and pedestrian modes as alternative transportation within an urban context. The alternative would provide infrastructure and as such is not urban in character. The alternative would not generate population. Therefore, this goal and policies do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and encourage bicycle and pedestrian modes as alternative transportation within an urban context. The alternative would provide infrastructure and as such is not urban in character. The alternative would not generate population. Therefore, this goal and policies do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and encourage bicycle and pedestrian modes as alternative transportation within an urban context. The alternative would provide infrastructure and as such is not urban in character. The alternative would not generate population. Therefore, this goal and policies do not apply.
GOAL M-12 and Policies M-12.1 through M-12.10 apply to the County Trails Program (County Trails Program, Regional Trails Plan, and the Community Trails Master Plan); trail planning; trail variety; land dedication for trails; funding; trail siting near scenic resources Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) areas, and educational and recreational facilities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the development and enhancement of public trails. However, the alternative would not preclude the location of a trail along SR 76 or a future trail through the site's permanent open space or habitat restoration area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the development and enhancement of public trails.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the development and enhancement of public trails.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the development and enhancement of public trails.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the development and enhancement of public trails. However, the alternative would not preclude the location of trails in the area, including the Otay Valley Regional Park open space (to the north/northwest of the site).

**TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)**

Goal/Policy	Applicant's Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Alternative
Table M-4 Identifies the County segment where the County has determined that the adverse impacts of adding travel lanes do not justify the resulting benefit of increased traffic capacity. Road Segments where adding an additional lane is not justified:  SR 76/Pala Road: From Old Highway 395 (Fallbrook) to I-15 SB Ramps (Fallbrook); Pala del Norte Road (Pala Pauma) to Sixth Street (Pala Pauma).	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This Table is based on the County's policy to accept reduce roadway capacity in lieu of the adverse impacts associated with of adding additional lanes. As reflected in Table M-4, the SR 76 right-of-way in the proximity of this site (east of Couser Canyon), as well as Old Highway to I-15 would remain at two lanes. The alternative would not require additional travel lanes.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Rainbow Glen Road, which provides access from I-15 to the site, is not listed in Table M-4.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Gopher Canyon Road, which provides access from I-15 to the site, is not listed in Table M-4.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Champagne Boulevard and Lawrence Welk Drive, which provide access from I-15 to the site, are not listed in Table M-4.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> SR 125 and Otay Mesa Road, which would provide access to the site, are not listed in Table M-4.
<b>Chapter 5 Conservation and Open Space</b>					
GOAL COS-1, to provide regionally managed, inter-connected preserve system that embodies the regional biological diversity of San Diego County, and Policies COS-1.1 through COS-1-11 apply to an interconnected system of preserves. These include a regionally managed, interconnected preserve system that represents the regional biological diversity of San Diego County. Policies are to identify and develop the system; to prohibit development within a preserve; to monitor and manage the system, to collaborate with other jurisdictions to achieve common goals; to identify funding mechanisms; to support a proactive system of preserves; to prohibit opportunities for invasive species; to provide a transparent and inclusive decision-making process, and to monitor volunteers.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Although the alternative would provide a minimum of 1,313 acres of permanent open space, it is not located within an area designated as a preserve.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within an existing preserve.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within an existing preserve.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within an existing preserve.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within an existing preserve.
Policy COS-6.5 Best Management Practices. Encourage best management practices in agriculture and animal operations to protect watersheds, reduce GHG emissions, conserve energy and water, and utilize alternative energy sources, including wind and solar power.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not an agricultural operation, and as such, this policy would not be applicable. While historically the site was used for dairies, the site is not currently active as an agricultural land use or operation.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not an agricultural operation under this definition, and as such, this policy would not be applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not an agricultural operation, and as such, this policy would not be applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not an agricultural operation, and as such, this policy would not be applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not an agricultural operation under this definition, and as such, this policy would not be applicable.
Policy COS-11.2 Scenic Resource Connections. Promote the connection of regionally significant natural features, designated historic landmarks, and points of regional historic, visual, and cultural interest via designated scenic corridors, such as scenic highways and regional trails.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to regional planning for the connectivity of scenic resources.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to regional planning for the connectivity of scenic resources.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to regional planning for the connectivity of scenic resources.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to regional planning for the connectivity of scenic resources.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to regional planning for the connectivity of scenic resources.

**TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Alternative</b>
Policy COS-13.3 Collaboration to Retain Night Skies. Coordinate with adjacent federal and State agencies, local jurisdictions, and tribal governments to retain the quality of night skies by minimizing light pollution.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to the County's collaboration with agencies, other jurisdictions, and tribal governments.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to the County's collaboration with agencies, other jurisdictions, and tribal governments.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to the County's collaboration with agencies, other jurisdictions, and tribal governments.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to the County's collaboration with agencies, other jurisdictions, and tribal governments.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to the County's collaboration with agencies, other jurisdictions, and tribal governments.
Policies COS-14.1, Require that development be located and designed to reduce vehicular trips (and associated air pollution) by utilizing compact regional and community-level development patterns while maintaining community character and COS-14.2 Incorporate a mixture of uses within Villages and Rural Villages that encourage people to walk, bicycle, or use public transit to reduce air pollution and GHG emissions.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies apply to urban development (residential and commercial uses) and would not be applicable to the proposed landfill alternative.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies apply to urban development (residential and commercial uses) and would not be applicable to the proposed landfill alternative.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies apply to urban development (residential and commercial uses) and would not be applicable to the proposed landfill alternative.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies apply to urban development (residential and commercial uses) and would not be applicable to the proposed landfill alternative.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies apply to urban development (residential and commercial uses) and would not be applicable to the proposed landfill alternative.
Policy COS-14.5 Building Siting and Orientation in Subdivisions. Require that buildings be located and oriented in new subdivisions and multi-structure non-residential projects to maximize passive solar heating during cool seasons, minimize heat gains during hot periods, enhance natural ventilation, and promote the effective use of daylight.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.
Policy COS-14.6 Solar Access for Infill Development. Require that property setbacks and building massing of new construction located within existing developed areas maintain an envelope that maximizes solar access to the extent feasible.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.
Policy COS-14.7 Alternative Energy Sources for Development projects. Encourage development projects that use energy recovery, photovoltaic, and wind energy.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The policy relates to subdivisions. The alternative is the construction, operation, and closure of a landfill. Thus, the policy does not apply.
Policy COS-14.13 Incentives for Sustainable and Low GHG Development. Provide incentives such as expedited alternative review and entitlement processing for developers that maximize use of sustainable and low GHG land development practices in exceedance of State and local standards.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Incentives for low GHG development would not be applicable to the alternative. However, emissions which are the precursors of GHGs would be controlled to the extent feasible (see Section 43, Air Quality and GHG Emissions, of the EIS).	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Incentives for low GHG development would not be applicable to the alternative. However, emissions which are the precursors of GHGs would be controlled to the extent feasible.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Incentives for low GHG development would not be applicable to the alternative. However, emissions which are the precursors of GHGs would be controlled to the extent feasible.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Incentives for low GHG development would not be applicable to the alternative. However, emissions which are the precursors of GHGs would be controlled to the extent feasible.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> Incentives for low GHG development would not be applicable to the alternative. However, emissions which are the precursors of GHGs would be controlled to the extent feasible.

**TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Alternative</b>
GOAL COS-16 and Policies COS-16.1 through COS-16.5 apply to sustainable transportation and mobility systems, alternative transportation modes, coordination with SANDAG and local transportation agencies, alternative transportation modes, transportation management to reduce single-occupancy vehicles, low emissions vehicles for County operations, alternative fuel stations, and transit center development	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies apply to the County and address the development of transportation policies and coordination between agencies.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies apply to the County and address the development of transportation policies and coordination between agencies.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies apply to the County and address the development of transportation policies and coordination between agencies.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies apply to the County and address the development of transportation policies and coordination between agencies.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies apply to the County and address the development of transportation policies and coordination between agencies.
Policy COS-17.2 Construction and Demolition Waste. Require recycling, reduction and reuse of construction and demolition debris.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and indicates that the County should require recycling, reduction, and reuse of construction and demolition debris. While this alternative does not provide for recycling of construction and demolition debris, the alternative would not impede the County's efforts in promoting construction waste recycling.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and indicates that the County should require recycling, reduction, and reuse of construction and demolition debris. While this alternative does not provide for recycling of construction and demolition debris, the alternative would not impede the County's efforts in promoting construction waste recycling.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and indicates that the County should require recycling, reduction, and reuse of construction and demolition debris. While this alternative does not provide for recycling of construction and demolition debris, the alternative would not impede the County's efforts in promoting construction waste recycling.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and indicates that the County should require recycling, reduction, and reuse of construction and demolition debris. While this alternative does not provide for recycling of construction and demolition debris, the alternative would not impede the County's efforts in promoting construction waste recycling.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and indicates that the County should require recycling, reduction, and reuse of construction and demolition debris. While this alternative does not provide for recycling of construction and demolition debris, the alternative would not impede the County's efforts in promoting construction waste recycling.
Policy COS-17.4 Composting. Encourage composting throughout the County and minimize the amount of organic materials disposed at landfills.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding composting as a way to minimize the amount of organic materials disposed of at landfills. The alternative would not impede the County's efforts in composting of organic waste.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding composting as a way to minimize the amount of organic materials disposed of at landfills. The alternative would not impede the County's efforts in composting of organic waste.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding composting as a way to minimize the amount of organic materials disposed of at landfills. The alternative would not impede the County's efforts in composting of organic waste.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding composting as a way to minimize the amount of organic materials disposed of at landfills. The alternative would not impede the County's efforts in composting of organic waste.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding composting as a way to minimize the amount of organic materials disposed of at landfills. The alternative would not impede the County's efforts in composting of organic waste.
Policy COS-17.6 Recycling Containers. Require that all new land development projects include space for recycling containers.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the provision of recycling containers in development projects. However, a recyclable drop-off area would be located on the east side of the maintenance building in the ancillary facilities area. The recyclable area would have bins for drop-off of source separated recyclable material, such as newsprint white paper, tin, aluminum, and glass.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the provision of recycling containers in development projects. However, a recyclable drop-off area would be located on the east side of the maintenance building in the ancillary facilities area. The recyclable area would have bins for drop-off of source separated recyclable material, such as newsprint white paper, tin, aluminum, and glass.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the provision of recycling containers in development projects. However, a recyclable drop-off area would be located on the east side of the maintenance building in the ancillary facilities area. The recyclable area would have bins for drop-off of source separated recyclable material, such as newsprint white paper, tin, aluminum, and glass.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the provision of recycling containers in development projects. However, a recyclable drop-off area would be located on the east side of the maintenance building in the ancillary facilities area. The recyclable area would have bins for drop-off of source separated recyclable material, such as newsprint white paper, tin, aluminum, and glass.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding the provision of recycling containers in development projects. However, a recyclable drop-off area would be located on the east side of the maintenance building in the ancillary facilities area. The recyclable area would have bins for drop-off of source separated recyclable material, such as newsprint white paper, tin, aluminum, and glass.
Policy COS-17.7 Material Recovery Program. Improve the County's rate of recycling by expanding solid waste recycling programs for residential and non-residential uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding programs to expand recycling for residential and non-residential uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding programs to expand recycling for residential and non-residential uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding programs to expand recycling for residential and non-residential uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding programs to expand recycling for residential and non-residential uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County regarding programs to expand recycling for residential and non-residential uses.

**TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Alternative</b>
Policy COS-17.8 Education. Continue programs to educate industry and the public regarding the need and methods for waste reduction, recycling, and reuse.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to the County's educational programs regarding solid waste reduction. However, this alternative would support resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to the County's educational programs regarding solid waste reduction. However, this alternative would support resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to the County's educational programs regarding solid waste reduction. However, this alternative would support resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to the County's educational programs regarding solid waste reduction. However, this alternative would support resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to the County's educational programs regarding solid waste reduction. However, this alternative would support resource recovery through the operation of a public drop-off area for source separated recyclables
GOAL COS-18 and Policy COS-18-1 apply to the development of energy systems that reduce consumption of non-renewable resources and to coordinate with SDG&E regarding alternate energy systems design.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy are directed toward the County and address alternate energy systems design.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy are directed toward the County and address alternate energy systems design.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy are directed toward the County and address alternate energy systems design.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy are directed toward the County and address alternate energy systems design.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy are directed toward the County and address alternate energy systems design.
GOAL COS-20 and Policies COS-20.1 through COS-20.4 apply to governance and administration for the reduction of GHG Emissions; the development of a climate change action plan; establishment of a program to monitor GHG emission; and public education regarding GHG.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed to the County and regard the administration of GHG policies and does not apply to the alternative. However, because GHGs are an issue of concern, an analysis of GHG emissions is provided in Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the EIS.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed to the County and regard the administration of GHG policies and does not apply to the alternative. However, because GHGs are an issue of concern, an analysis of GHG emissions is provided in Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the EIS.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed to the County and regard the administration of GHG policies and does not apply to the alternative. However, because GHGs are an issue of concern, an analysis of GHG emissions is provided in Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the EIS.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed to the County and regard the administration of GHG policies and does not apply to the alternative. However, because GHGs are an issue of concern, an analysis of GHG emissions is provided in Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the EIS.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed to the County and regard the administration of GHG policies and does not apply to the alternative. However, because GHGs are an issue of concern, an analysis of GHG emissions is provided in Section 4.3, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the EIS.
GOAL COS-21 and Policies COS-21.1 through Policy COS-21.1 apply to parks and recreational facilities, diversity of users and services, locations of parks, park design, and connectivity of parks and trails.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not contain a park or recreational facilities. As a landfill use, the alternative would not cause an increase in local or regional populations that generate a demand for recreational services.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not contain a park or recreational facilities. As a landfill use, the alternative would not cause an increase in local or regional populations that generate a demand for recreational services.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not contain a park or recreational facilities. As a landfill use, the alternative would not cause an increase in local or regional populations that generate a demand for recreational services.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not contain a park or recreational facilities. As a landfill use, the alternative would not cause an increase in local or regional populations that generate a demand for recreational services.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not contain a park or recreational facilities. As a landfill use, the alternative would not cause an increase in local or regional populations that generate a demand for recreational services.
GOAL COS-22 and Policy COS-22.1 apply to park and recreational services, the provision of recreational programs, and the creation of a variety of recreational programs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not require recreational services or provide recreational programs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not require recreational services or provide recreational programs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not require recreational services or provide recreational programs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not require recreational services or provide recreational programs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not require recreational services or provide recreational programs.
GOAL COS-23 and Policies COS-23.1 through COS-23.3 apply to recreational opportunities in preserves, public access, regional coordination for the development and management of preserved open space, and regional coordination to ensure public safety.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would provide permanent open space for habitat restoration and preservation; however, the site has not been identified by the County as part of the County's system. The proposed open space would be dedicated or conveyed in perpetuity to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site has not been identified by the County as part of the County's system. However, at the closure of the landfill, the property would be maintained as permanent open space. The proposed open space would be dedicated or conveyed in perpetuity to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site has not been identified by the County as part of the County's system. However, at the closure of the landfill, the property would be maintained as permanent open space. The proposed open space would be dedicated or conveyed in perpetuity to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site has not been identified by the County as part of the County's system. However, at the closure of the landfill, the property would be maintained as permanent open space. The proposed open space would be dedicated or conveyed in perpetuity to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site has not been identified by the County as part of the County's system. However, at the closure of the landfill, the property would be maintained as permanent open space. The proposed open space would be dedicated or conveyed in perpetuity to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego.



**TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Alternative</b>
GOAL COS-24 and Policies COS-24.1 and 24.2 apply to funding for acquisition, development, maintenance, management, and operation of parks, recreation facilities, and preserves; requiring development to provide fair share contributions, and maximizing funding opportunities for parks, recreation facilities, preserves, and trails.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy apply to the funding of parks and recreational facilities and identify potential funding sources and opportunities. The alternative would not provide a park or recreational facilities. In addition, since this alternative is a non-residential use, Quimby fee contributions to develop recreational facilities would not be required.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy apply to the funding of parks and recreational facilities and identify potential funding sources and opportunities. The alternative would not provide a park or recreational facilities. In addition, since this alternative is a non-residential use, Quimby fee contributions to develop recreational facilities would not be required.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy apply to the funding of parks and recreational facilities and identify potential funding sources and opportunities. The alternative would not provide a park or recreational facilities. In addition, since this alternative is a non-residential use, Quimby fee contributions to develop recreational facilities would not be required.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy apply to the funding of parks and recreational facilities and identify potential funding sources and opportunities. The alternative would not provide a park or recreational facilities. In addition, since this alternative is a non-residential use, Quimby fee contributions to develop recreational facilities would not be required.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policy apply to the funding of parks and recreational facilities and identify potential funding sources and opportunities. The alternative would not provide a park or recreational facilities. In addition, since this alternative is a non-residential use, Quimby fee contributions to develop recreational facilities would not be required.
<b>Chapter 6 Housing Element</b>					
	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward housing policies and would not be applicable to the site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to County housing policies and would not be applicable to the site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to County housing policies and would not be applicable to the site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to County housing policies and would not be applicable to the site.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to County housing policies and would not be applicable to the site.
<b>Chapter 7 Safety Element</b>					
Policy S-1.4 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. Review and update the County's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan every five years.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and requires an update of a County plan.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and requires an update of a County plan.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and requires an update of a County plan.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and requires an update of a County plan.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and requires an update of a County plan.
Policy S-1.5 Post-disaster Reconstruction. Participate in the development of programs and procedures that emphasize coordination between appropriate public agencies and private entities to remove debris and promote the rapid reconstruction of the County following a disaster event and facilitate the upgrading of the built environment as expeditiously as possible.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to programs to support regional reconstruction efforts. The alternative would have no direct role or authority in the development of such programs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to programs to support regional reconstruction efforts. The alternative would have no direct role or authority in the development of such programs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to programs to support regional reconstruction efforts. The alternative would have no direct role or authority in the development of such programs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to programs to support regional reconstruction efforts. The alternative would have no direct role or authority in the development of such programs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to programs to support regional reconstruction efforts. The alternative would have no direct role or authority in the development of such programs.
GOAL S-2 and Policies S-2.1 through S-2.6 apply to emergency response programs, emergency management system training, participation in mutual aid systems, familiarity with national and state response plans, emergency disaster education programs, and implementation of flood warning systems and evacuation plans, and development of programs in the event of a natural disaster.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the administration of emergency response programs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the administration of emergency response programs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the administration of emergency response programs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the administration of emergency response programs.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the administration of emergency response programs.
Policy S-3.4 Service Availability. Plan for development where fire and emergency services are available or planned.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to the development of land use plans based on service availability.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to the development of land use plans based on service availability.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to the development of land use plans based on service availability.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to the development of land use plans based on service availability.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to the development of land use plans based on service availability.

**TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Alternative</b>
GOAL S-4 and Policies S-4.1 through S-4.3 apply to management of fuel loads, fuel management programs consistent with state law, strategic fuel modification, coordination with CAL FIRE, U.S. Forest Service, local fire districts, and wildlife agencies for recommendations to minimize fuel management impacts, and forest health.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the County's need for a regional fuel management program that would address the relationship of vegetation density and fire hazard.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the County's need for a regional fuel management program that would address the relationship of vegetation density and fire hazard.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the County's need for a regional fuel management program that would address the relationship of vegetation density and fire hazard.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the County's need for a regional fuel management program that would address the relationship of vegetation density and fire hazard.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and apply to the County's need for a regional fuel management program that would address the relationship of vegetation density and fire hazard.
GOAL S-5 and Policies S-5.1 through S-5.3 apply to regional fire protection, coordination among fire protection agencies, fire service provider agreements and coordination with fire protection and emergency service providers to reassess fire hazards.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and address coordination among fire service agencies and providers.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and address coordination among fire service agencies and providers.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and address coordination among fire service agencies and providers.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and address coordination among fire service agencies and providers.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County and address coordination among fire service agencies and providers.
Policy S-7.4 Unreinforced Masonry Structures. Require the retrofiting of unreinforced masonry structures to minimize damage in the event of seismic or geologic hazards.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not incorporate any existing, unreinforced masonry structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not incorporate any existing, unreinforced masonry structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not incorporate any existing, unreinforced masonry structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not incorporate any existing, unreinforced masonry structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not incorporate any existing, unreinforced masonry structures.
Policy S-7.5 Retrofitting of Essential Facilities. Seismic retrofit essential facilities to minimize damage in the event of seismic or geologic hazards.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not incorporate any existing facilities/structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not incorporate any existing facilities/structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not incorporate any existing facilities/structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not incorporate any existing facilities/structures.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative does not incorporate any existing facilities/structures.
Policy S-9.4 Development in Villages. Allow new uses and development within the floodplain fringe (land within the floodplain outside of the floodway) only when environmental impacts and hazards are mitigated. This policy does not apply to floodplains with unmapped floodways. Require land available outside the floodplain to be fully utilized before locating development within a floodplain. Development within a floodplain may be denied if it will cause significant adverse environmental impacts or is prohibited in the community plan. Channelization of floodplains is allowed within villages only when specifically addressed in community plans.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not development in a village. As such, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not development in a village. As such, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not development in a village. As such, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not development in a village. As such, the policy does not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not development in a village. As such, the policy does not apply.
Policy S-9.6 Development in Dam Inundation Areas. Prohibit development in dam inundation areas that may interfere with the County's emergency response and evacuation plans.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located with a dam inundation area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located with a dam inundation area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located with a dam inundation area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located with a dam inundation area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located with a dam inundation area.

**TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)**

<b>Goal/Policy</b>	<b>Applicant's Proposed Alternative</b>	<b>Aspen Road Alternative</b>	<b>Gopher Canyon Road Alternative</b>	<b>Merriam Mountain Alternative</b>	<b>East Otay Alternative</b>
Policies S-10.2 through S-10.4 apply to the use of natural channels for County flood control facilities, size and maintenance of flood control facilities, and stormwater management.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County regarding the County's use and maintenance of flood control facilities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County regarding the County's use and maintenance of flood control facilities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County regarding the County's use and maintenance of flood control facilities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County regarding the County's use and maintenance of flood control facilities.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County regarding the County's use and maintenance of flood control facilities.
GOAL S-12 and Policy S-12.1 apply to the provision of equivalent law enforcement facilities throughout the County.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and policy are directed toward the County. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and policy are directed toward the County. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and policy are directed toward the County. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and policy are directed toward the County. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and policy are directed toward the County. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply.
GOAL S-13 and Policies S-13.1 and S.-13.2 apply to safe communities programs, the location of sheriff facilities in areas of corresponding demand, and location of sheriff facilities in non-residential areas.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and respective policies are directed toward the County. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and policy are directed toward the County. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and policy are directed toward the County. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and policy are directed toward the County. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This goal and policy are directed toward the County. Thus, the goal and policy do not apply.
Policy S-14.2 Development Safety Techniques. Require development within Village areas to utilize planning and design techniques, as appropriate, that deter crime.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within a Village area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within a Village area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within a Village area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within a Village area.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within a Village area.
Policy S-14.3 Crime Prevention. Coordinate with appropriate agencies and the community to reduce crime in all neighborhoods by improving communication and relationships with communities and through educational programs that address important safety issues.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not be located in a community setting.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not be located in a community setting.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not be located in a community setting.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not be located in a community setting.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative would not be located in a community setting.
GOAL S-15 and Policies A-15.1 through A-15.4 apply to airport zone hazards, airport operational plans, and heliport and airstrip locations.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within the vicinity of an airport or airstrip, nor does the alternative incorporate airport-related uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within the vicinity of an airport or airstrip, nor does the alternative incorporate airport-related uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within the vicinity of an airport or airstrip, nor does the alternative incorporate airport-related uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is not located within the vicinity of an airport or airstrip, nor does the alternative incorporate airport-related uses.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy would not be applicable because the site is located several miles from Brown Field, the nearest airport/airstrip.
<b>Chapter 8 Noise Element</b>					
N-1.4 Adjacent Jurisdiction Noise Standards. Incorporate the noise standards of an adjacent jurisdiction into the evaluation of a proposed alternative when it has the potential to impact the noise environment of that jurisdiction.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located adjacent to or near the boundary of another jurisdiction.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located adjacent to or near the boundary of another jurisdiction.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located adjacent to or near the boundary of another jurisdiction.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is not located adjacent to or near the boundary of another jurisdiction.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The site is located near the international boundary with Mexico and the City of Tijuana. However, no process exists by which the County coordinates noise standards with the City of Tijuana.
Policy N-2.2 Balconies and Patios. Assure that in developments where the exterior noise level on patios or balconies for multi-family residences or mixed-use developments exceed 65 CNEL, a solid noise barrier is incorporated into the building design of the balconies and patios while still maintaining the openness of the patio or balcony.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to residential construction and therefore is not applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to residential construction and therefore is not applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to residential construction and therefore is not applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to residential construction and therefore is not applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy applies to residential construction and therefore is not applicable.

TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

Goal/Policy	Applicant’s Proposed Alternative	Aspen Road Alternative	Gopher Canyon Road Alternative	Merriam Mountain Alternative	East Otay Alternative
Policies N-4.2 through N-4.9 apply to urban traffic noise, traffic calming, state motor vehicle standards, railway jurisdiction, train horn noise, airport compatibility	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County in establishing standards and procedures to address urban traffic noise. Therefore, the policies are not applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County in establishing standards and procedures to address urban traffic noise. Therefore, the policies are not applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County in establishing standards and procedures to address urban traffic noise. Therefore, the policies are not applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County in establishing standards and procedures to address urban traffic noise. Therefore, the policies are not applicable.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County in establishing standards and procedures to address urban traffic noise. Therefore, the policies are not applicable.
GOAL N-6 and Policies N-6.1 through N-6.3 apply to temporary and/or nuisance noise; noise codes and ordinances; and recurring, intermittent high noise equipment,	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County and apply to the development of programs to control nuisance noise.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County and apply to the development of programs to control nuisance noise.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County and apply to the development of programs to control nuisance noise.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County and apply to the development of programs to control nuisance noise.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> These policies are directed toward the County and apply to the development of programs to control nuisance noise.
Policy N-6.5 Special Events. Schedule special events sponsored by the County that may generate excessive noise levels to daytime hours when feasible.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is a development alternative and would not include any special events sponsored by the County.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is a development alternative and would not include any special events sponsored by the County.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is a development alternative and would not include any special events sponsored by the County.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is a development alternative and would not include any special events sponsored by the County.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The alternative is a development alternative and would not include any special events sponsored by the County.
Policy N-6.6 Code Enforcement. Provide sufficient resources within the County for effective enforcement of County codes and ordinances.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to code enforcement.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to code enforcement.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to code enforcement.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to code enforcement.	<b>Not Applicable.</b> This policy is directed toward the County and applies to code enforcement.
<hr/> Source: PCR Services Corporation, 2012					

TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF SYCAMORE CANYON EXPANSION CITY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES From Table 5.1-1, Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan, Revised Final EIR August 2012		
APPLICABLE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND POLICIES	CONSISTENCY EVALUATION	CONSISTENT (YES/NO)
City of San Diego General Plan		
Land Use and Community Planning Element		
<b>Consistency Goals</b> <b>Goal:</b> Adopt Zoning concurrently with community plan updates and amendments to ensure consistency with community plan land use designations.	A rezone of those areas to be included in the landfill which are not currently designated with a compatible zone is requested. Areas currently zoned as Residential (RS-1-8) would be rezoned to Heavy Industrial (IH-2-1). This rezone would ensure consistency with the proposed amendment to the General Plan and East Elliot Community Plan. Therefore, no conflict with this consistency goal would occur.	Yes
<i>Policy LU-G.4:</i> Submit development projects affected by an airport influence area to the ALUC after the adoption or amendment to an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan to ensure that they are consistent up until the time that the ALUC has determined the General Plan, community plans, and specific plans consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan or have the City Council take steps to overrule the ALUC.  <i>Policy LU-G.5:</i> Implement the height standards used by the FAA as defined by Code of Federal Regulations Title 14, Part 77 through development regulations and zoning ordinances.  <i>Policy LU-G.6:</i> Require that all proposed development projects (ministerial and discretionary actions) notify the FAA in areas where the proposed development meets the notification criteria as defined by Code of Federal Regulation Title 14, Part 77.  a. Require that all proposed development projects that are subject to FAA notification requirement provide documentation that FAA has determined that the project is not a Hazard to Air Navigation prior to project approval.  b. Require that the Planning Commission and City Council approve any proposed development that the FAA has determined to be a Hazard to Air Navigation once state and ALUC requirements are satisfied.  <i>Policy LU-G.9:</i> Coordinate with the Navy and Marine Corps to ensure that future land use and General Plan, community plan, specific plan, development regulations and zoning ordinances amendments are consistent with the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone study for military air installations	<p>The project site is located within the Airport Influence Area for MCAS Miramar. The SDRAA has determined that the project would not conflict with aircraft operations at MCAS Miramar. Therefore, no conflict with Policies LU-G.1, LU-G.2, LU-G.4 would occur.</p> <p>No Hazard to Air Navigation determinations in regard to landfill peaks and transmission poles received FAA approval in 2006 with extensions received in 2011 (refer to Appendix C1 of the Sycamore Landfill Master Development Plan Final EIR). Therefore, no conflict with Policies LU-G.5 and LU-G.6 would occur.</p> <p>Pursuant to Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 21675 (b), local jurisdictions’ airport land use compatibility plans shall be consistent with the safety and noise standards in the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) prepared for that military airport.” The AICUZ is developed for military air installations to protect public and aviator safety and avoid land use development that would encroach on the installation’s viability. As a part of its 2008 update, the MCAS Miramar ALUCP adopted safety policies consistent with the restrictions found in the military’s AICUZ plan (SDRAA 2008). As discussed above, the proposed uses have been evaluated under the local jurisdictional land use compatibility plan, the MCAS Miramar ALUCP, and determined compatible by the SDRAA in 2008. No Hazard to Air Navigation determinations were approved by the FAA for relocation of the landfill peaks and transmission poles (Appendix C1 of the Sycamore Landfill Master Development Plan Final EIR). Therefore, no conflict with Policy LU-G.9 would occur.</p>	Yes

TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF SYCAMORE CANYON EXPANSION CITY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES From Table 5.1-1, Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan, Revised Final EIR August 2012		
APPLICABLE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND POLICIES	CONSISTENCY EVALUATION	CONSISTENT (YES/NO)
<p><b>Goal:</b> Ensure a just and equitable society by increasing public outreach and participation in the planning process.</p> <p><i>Planning Process Policies</i></p> <p><i>Policy LU-I.1:</i> Ensure environmental justice in the planning process through meaningful public involvement.</p> <p>a. Assure potentially affected community residents that they have opportunities to participate in decisions that affect their environment and health, and that the concerns of all participants involved will be considered in the decision-making process.</p> <p>b. Increase public outreach to all segments of the community so that it is informative and detailed in terms of process and options available to the community.</p> <p>c. Consult with California Native American tribes to provide them with an opportunity to participate in local land use decisions at an early planning stage, for the purpose of protecting, or mitigating impacts to cultural places.</p> <p><i>Policy LU-I.2:</i> Balance individual needs and wants with the public good.</p> <p><i>Policy LU-I. 16:</i> Ensure the provision of noise abatement and control policies that do not disenfranchise, or provide special treatment of, any particular group, location of concern, or economic status.</p>	<p>As part of the public outreach for the project, the City prepared a NOP and distributed it to the public on November 9, 2011. The distribution of the NOP included members of the general public, local Native American Tribes, and governmental agencies. In addition, a public scoping meeting was held on November 30, 2011, at the Mission Trails Regional Park Visitor’s Center, to inform the public about the project and receive comments. Copies of the NOP and comment letters, as well as a transcript of the scoping meeting, are contained in Appendix A of the Sycamore Landfill Master Development Plan Final EIR. These outreach efforts are consistent with Policy LU-I.1.</p> <p>Processing a CPA and a PDP is a public process. The process requires that noticing is provided to all interested parties, notices of public hearing for the Planning Commission and the City Council are published in a local newspaper, and a presentation to and recommendations from affected community planning groups is requested.</p> <p>In accordance with Policy LU-I.2, the project would expand an existing regional landfill that is privately operated by SLI. The expansion would provide a balance of individual welfare and public good by assisting in fulfilling the City and regions’ need for long term waste disposal that are required by the County Integrated Waste Management Plan. No significant impacts to nearby residential communities are identified. The applicant would involve the public in the Odor and Noise management plans it would implement at the landfill to ensure that community concerns are addressed.</p> <p>The project would comply with the City’s Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance and General Plan Policy LU-1.16. Through compliance with these regulations, no particular group, location of concern, or economic status would experience either disenfranchisement or special treatment in terms of noise abatement as a result of the project. See Section 5.3 for further discussion.</p>	Yes
<b>Economic Prosperity Element</b>		
<p><b>Base Sector Industrial Uses Goals</b></p> <p><i>Policy EP-A.5:</i> Consider the redesignation of non-industrial properties to industrial use where land use conflicts can be minimized. Evaluate the extent to which the proposed designation and subsequent industrial development would: Accommodate the expansion of existing industrial uses to facilitate their retention in the area in which they are located.</p> <p>Not intrude into existing residential neighborhoods or disrupt existing commercial activities and other uses.</p> <p>Mitigate any environmental impacts (traffic, noise, lighting, air pollution and odor) to adjacent land.</p> <p>Be adequately served by existing and planned infrastructure.</p>	<p>The project would redesignate non-industrial property (i.e., Open Space) to Industrial use along the western edge of the landfill and along the landfill access road in an area where land use conflicts with existing residential neighborhoods would be minimized and impacts to adjacent lands can be mitigated. The project would also expand an existing industrial use, further ensuring adequate landfill capacity in the City. Improvements to the reclaimed water storage system and local street network would be implemented to ensure the site is adequately served by infrastructure. The project is consistent with Policy EP-A.5.</p>	Yes
<p><b>Military Installation Goals</b></p> <p><b>Goal:</b> A city which preserves the ability of military installations to achieve their mission and to remain in San Diego.</p> <p><i>Policy EP-H.1:</i> Coordinate with military base representatives to ensure that community plan updates and amendments, rezones, and projects for areas adjacent to military facilities, or underlying designated military training routes and airspace, do not affect military readiness. Projects and plan preparation should consider the impact of future land uses on public safety and military readiness activities carried out on military bases, installations, and operating and training areas based upon the information that the military and other sources provide.</p>	<p>The project site is located near MCAS Miramar. Coordination with military base representatives has been achieved by including the appropriate contacts for the Marine Corps on the project’s mailing list. MCAS Miramar received the NOP for the project. MCAS Miramar is included on the project’s mailing list and will be provided further notification regarding the project and the opportunity to comment on the project. The project would not impact public safety or military readiness at MCAS Miramar or any other military installations.</p>	Yes

TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF SYCAMORE CANYON EXPANSION CITY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES From Table 5.1-1, Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan, Revised Final EIR August 2012		
APPLICABLE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND POLICIES	CONSISTENCY EVALUATION	CONSISTENT (YES/NO)
<p><b>Goal:</b> Promote and ensure environmental protection that will emphasize the importance of safe and healthy communities.</p> <p><i>Environmental Protection Policies</i> <i>Policy LU-I.12:</i> Ensure environmental protection that does not unfairly burden or omit any one geographic or socioeconomic sector of the City.</p> <p><i>Policy LU-I.14:</i> As part of community plan updates or amendments that involve land use or intensity changes, evaluate public health risks associated with identified sources of hazardous substances and toxic air emissions (see also Conservation Element, Section F). Create adequate distance separation, based on documents such as those recommended by the California Air Resources Board and site specific analysis, between sensitive receptor land use designations and potential identified sources of hazardous substances such as freeways, industrial operations or areas such as warehouses, train depots, port facilities, etc.</p> <p><i>Policy LU-I.15:</i> Plan for the equal distribution of potentially hazardous and/or undesirable, yet necessary, land uses, public facilities and services, and businesses to avoid over concentration in any</p>	<p>The project is the expansion of an existing landfill. While the project would include the development of additional land for landfill and ancillary facilities, the project site is not located within a disadvantaged community, and does not propose features or actions which would unfairly result in undesirable environmental impacts on any geographic or socioeconomic sector of the City. Environmental impacts resulting from the project, and associated mitigation measures, would be specific to and localized at the site. In this way, the project would be in conformance with Policy LU-I.12.</p> <p>No public health risks associated with hazardous substances and toxic air emissions would be created by the proposed uses as detailed in Section 5.6 and as discussed under, Section 10.2,<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>. As such, the project would be in compliance with Policy LU-I.14.</p> <p>As the subject property is a currently operating landfill, the project would not affect the distribution of undesirable land uses within the City of San Diego. Therefore, the project would be consistent with Policy LU-I.15.</p>	Yes
<b>Mobility Element</b>		
<p><b>Goal:</b> Vehicle congestion relief. <i>ME-C.2</i> Provide adequate capacity and reduce congestion for all modes of transportation on the street and freeway system.</p> <p><i>Policy ME-C.8:</i> Implement Traffic Impact Study Guidelines that address site and community specific issues.</p> <p>a. Give consideration to the role of alternative modes of transportation and transportation demand management (TDM) plans in addressing development project traffic impacts.</p> <p>b. Consider the results of site-specific studies or reports that justify vehicle trip reductions (see also ME-E.7).</p> <p>c. Implement best practices for multi-modal quality/level of service analysis guidelines to evaluate potential transportation impacts and determine appropriate mitigation measures from a multi-modal perspective.</p>	<p>The project would increase the daily traffic and result in near-term and long-term impacts, as discussed in Section 5.2. Changes to the operating hours of the landfill would assist in distributing facility traffic more broadly throughout the day and allow for 24-hour waste disposal and processing operations. In addition to improvements at the intersection of Mast Boulevard/ West Hills Parkway/Landfill Entrance and along the segment of Mast Boulevard between the landfill entrance and SR-52 westbound on-ramp, the increased operating hours would provide a means for reducing roadway congestion at the landfill by allowing trucks to access the site outside of peak hours, consistent with policies ME-C.2. Refer to Section 5.2 for additional discussion on the traffic impacts and mitigation. In addition, SLI would voluntarily implement a TDM strategy which would seek to further reduce project traffic during the peak commuter periods in the community and SR-52 freeway.</p> <p>Landfill operations do not lend themselves to incorporation of alternative (or multi-modal) modes of transportation since the primary traffic is heavy trucks hauling waste to the facility Thus, the project is consistent with the applicable portions of Policy ME-C.8.</p>	Yes
<b>Urban Design Element</b>		
<p><b>General Urban Design Goals</b> <b>Goal:</b> A built environment that respects San Diego’s natural environment and climate.</p>	<p>A total of approximately 26 acres of land currently designated for Open Space on the General Plan and EECF would be converted to a Industrial and/or Landfill designation as a result of the General Plan and Community Plan amendments being requested by the project applicant.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Natural Features</i> <i>Policy UD-A.1:</i> Preserve and protect natural landforms and features.</p> <p>A . Protect the integrity of community plan designated open spaces (see also Conservation Element, Policy CE-B.1).</p>	<p>While the project would result in the modification of natural terrain to accommodate continued landfill operations, these activities would occur adjacent to an existing landfill operation which has already modified natural terrain to a substantial degree. In addition, once the expansion is complete, the landform would resemble that of the undeveloped surrounding natural terrain, as discussed in Section 5.4 of this report. Nonetheless, the project would cause a loss of open space and would represent a substantial conflict with Policy UD-A.1.</p>	No

TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF SYCAMORE CANYON EXPANSION CITY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES From Table 5.1-1, Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan, Revised Final EIR August 2012		
APPLICABLE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND POLICIES	CONSISTENCY EVALUATION	CONSISTENT (YES/NO)
<i>Lighting</i> <i>Policy UD-A.13.</i> Provide lighting from a variety of sources at appropriate intensities and qualities for safety.  c. Use lighting to convey a sense of safety while minimizing glare and contrast.  d. Use vandal-resistant light fixtures that complement the neighborhood and character.  e. Focus lighting to eliminate spill-over so that lighting is directed, and only the intended use is illuminated.	As part of the project, solid waste disposal operations could occur up to 24 hours per day. This would require the use of additional lighting to support nighttime operations. Lighting would be shielded, directed downward, and would be the minimum wattage needed to provide visibility (see Table 3.3, <i>Project Design Measures and Control Features Supporting Analysis</i> of the Sycamore Landfill Master Development Plan Final EIR). Thus, no conflict with Policy UD-A.13 would occur.	Yes
<b>Conservation Element</b>		
<b><i>Climate Change and Sustainable Development Goals</i></b> <b>Goal:</b> To reduce the City's overall carbon dioxide footprint by promoting energy efficiency, alternative modes of transportation, sustainable planning and design, and waste management.  <b>Goal:</b> To be prepared for, and able to adapt to adverse climate change impacts.  <b>Goal:</b> To become a city that is an international model of sustainable development and conservation.  <i>Policy CE-A.2:</i> Reduce the City's carbon footprint. Develop and adopt new or amended regulations, programs, and incentives as appropriate to implement the goals and policies set forth in the General Plan to:  Create sustainable and efficient land use patterns to reduce vehicular trips and preserve open space;  Reduce fuel emission levels by encouraging alternative modes of transportation and increasing fuel efficiency;  Improve energy efficiency, especially in the transportation sector and buildings and appliances;  Reduce the Urban Heat Island effect through sustainable design and building practices, as well as planting trees (consistent with habitat and water conservation policies) for their many environmental benefits, including natural carbon sequestration;  Reduce waste by improving management and recycling programs; and  Plan for water supply and emergency reserves.  <i>Policy CE-A.5:</i> Employ sustainable or “green” building techniques for the construction and operation of buildings. a. Develop and implement sustainable building standards for new and significant remodels of residential and commercial buildings to maximize energy efficiency, and to achieve overall net zero energy consumption by 2020 for new residential buildings and 2030 for new commercial buildings. This can be accomplished through factors including, but not limited to:  Designing mechanical and electrical systems that achieve greater energy efficiency with currently available technology;  Minimizing energy use through innovative site design and building orientation that addresses factors such as sun-shade patterns, prevailing winds, landscape, and sun-screens;  Employing self generation of energy using renewable Technologies	The project is designed to help ensure adequate disposal capacity for municipal solid waste (MSW) in the City of San Diego and the greater San Diego region, through more efficient use of an existing and centrally located landfill site. Because of its central location within San Diego County, expansion of the Sycamore Landfill would minimize energy (in the form of fuel) consumption by waste haul vehicles delivering waste for disposal. Expansion of the existing landfill also would be more efficient and sustainable with regard to impacts to open space as compared to the alternative of developing a new landfill at an alternative location, which would likely result in greater impacts to open space.  A number of Project Design Features would be implemented during the project construction and operation to reduce energy consumption and, as a result, reduce the carbon footprint of the landfill operation. Please refer to Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> and Section 5.8, <i>Energy</i> , of the Sycamore Landfill Master Development Plan Final EIR for discussion of these features. The project also would implement a 90-percent landfill methane (CH4) capture program, and state- and federal-mandated vehicle emission reduction programs to reduce GHG emissions, as discussed further in Section 5.7, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i> . Implementation of these measures would allow the project to comply with the sustainable development goals identified in Policies CE-A.2 and CE-A.5.  The project includes the construction of new buildings including a maintenance facility, scale and public drop-off facilities, and administrative offices. The existing scale house would be relocated, and the modular units currently used for offices would be moved off-site for reuse. The continued use of the relocated scale house and removal of the modular units to an off-site location would serve to reduce construction and demolition (C&D) waste in accordance with Policy CE-A.8. Additionally, the project includes the development of a facility for processing and recycling source-separated C&D debris. The C&D processing system would target primarily waste loads rich in wood and inert materials such as rock, brick, concrete and asphalt and would help to decrease C&D in the San Diego region that is disposed of as waste. It is estimated that initial intake of C&D materials at Sycamore Landfill would be approximately 500 tons per day (tpd) and expand to 1,150 tpd by 2035. The addition of the C&D processing at the landfill would provide the region with increased opportunity to reduce C&D waste and would be in alignment with Policy CE-A.9.  In compliance with the City's Recycling Ordinance, the project would provide dedicated areas for the collection of green waste and recyclable materials and would ensure a collection service be provided for project operation. Therefore, the project would comply with Policy CE-A.10.  Greens processing would be enhanced and composting may be offered at SLI in the future; this possibility is being reviewed on program level in the MDP EIR as there are too many unknowns about the operations to assure complete analysis at this stage. Project-level CEQA analyses would be required prior to implementation of any future composting activity on site. Prior to proceeding with composting operations, SLI also would need to apply for and obtain appropriate permits through the City of San Diego LEA and APCD, in conformance with	Yes
		Yes
		Yes
		Yes



TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF SYCAMORE CANYON EXPANSION CITY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES From Table 5.1-1, Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan, Revised Final EIR August 2012		
APPLICABLE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND POLICIES	CONSISTENCY EVALUATION	CONSISTENT (YES/NO)
<p>Combining energy efficient measures that have longer payback periods with measures that have shorter payback periods;</p> <p>Reducing levels of non-essential lighting, heating and cooling; and</p> <p>Using energy efficient appliances and lighting.</p> <p><i>Policy CE-A.8:</i> Reduce construction and demolition waste in accordance with Public Facilities Element, Policy PF-I.2, or by renovating or adding on to existing buildings, rather than constructing new buildings.</p> <p><i>Policy CE-A.9:</i> Reuse building materials, use materials that have recycled content, or use materials that are derived from sustainable or rapidly renewable sources to the extent possible, through factors including:</p> <p>Scheduling time for deconstruction and recycling activities to take place during project demolition and construction phases;</p> <p>Using life cycle costing in decision-making for materials and construction techniques. Life cycle costing analyzes the costs and benefits over the life of a particular product, technology, or system;</p> <p>Removing code obstacles to using recycled materials in buildings and for construction; and</p> <p>Implementing effective economic incentives to recycle construction and demolition debris (see also Public Facilities Element, Policy PF-I.2).</p> <p><i>Policy CE-A.10:</i> Include features in buildings to facilitate recycling of waste generated by building occupants and associated refuse storage areas.</p> <p>a. Provide permanent, adequate, and convenient space for individual building occupants to collect refuse and recyclable material.</p> <p>b. Provide a recyclables collection area that serves the entire building or project. The space should allow for the separation, collection and storage of paper, glass, plastic, metals, yard waste and other materials as needed.</p> <p><i>Policy CE-A.11:</i> Implement sustainable landscape design and maintenance.</p> <p>a. Use integrated pest management techniques, where feasible, to delay, reduce, or eliminate dependence on the use of pesticides, herbicides, and synthetic fertilizers.</p> <p>b. Encourage composting efforts through education, incentives, and other activities.</p> <p>c. Decrease the amount of impervious surfaces in developments, especially where public places, plazas and amenities are proposed to serve as recreation opportunities (see also Recreation Element, Policy RE-A.6 and A.7).</p> <p>d. Strategically plant deciduous shade trees, evergreen trees, and drought tolerant native vegetation, as appropriate, to contribute to sustainable development goals.</p> <p>e. Reduce use of lawn types that require high levels of irrigation.</p>	<p>14 CCR 17850-17670.</p> <p>Landscaping associated with the project would be limited to around the scale, recycling area, administrative offices and associated parking area. Landscaping would emphasize the use of plants native to southern California to reduce water consumption. Trees would be planted to maximize shade around the buildings and parking lots. All landscape and irrigation would conform to the standards set forth in the City of San Diego LDC and Landscape Standards Manual and other applicable City and regional standards. In addition, SLI would continue to use reclaimed water as its primary source of water for dust control and other operational uses, such as landscape irrigation. Therefore, the project would comply with Policy CE-A.11.</p> <p>The project includes project design features to minimize potential “Urban Heat Island Effects.” The three scale house structures would each be constructed of painted concrete masonry units (CMUs) or blocks, with a pitched copper roof. The administrative office building would be a rectangular structure with a covered portico on the north side of the building and would have a roof with a flattened top gable and sloping sides covered with copper flashing. Trees would be planted to maximize shade around the buildings and parking lots. All landscape and irrigation would conform to the standards set forth in the City of San Diego LDC and Landscape Standards Manual and other applicable City and regional standards. Therefore, the project would comply with Policy CE-A.12.</p> <p>The Sycamore Landfill has a landfill Gas Collection and Control System (GCCS) which is considered an ‘active’ gas collection system, which would be expanded over time for the MDP project. The collected LFG would continue to be combusted within enclosed flare systems and/or used as a fuel for electrical generation turbines; LFG is considered a renewable energy source. Combustion of LFG to produce electricity would replace fossil fuel used for power generation and the associated GHG emissions.</p> <p>Periodic testing would continue to be performed to evaluate the effectiveness of the LFG control system and to verify the landfill is in compliance with the surface emission and subsurface boundary migration limits contained in Federal NSPS rule, SDAPCD Rule 59.1 and CCR Title 27. This testing would also be required to comply with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) early action measure which specifies even lower surface integrated average emissions limits than Title 27. The test program would continue to include the following components: flare station monitoring (weekly) and LFG extraction well monitoring (monthly), which monitor methane, oxygen, carbon dioxide, and nitrogen (balance) gas concentrations; perimeter probe monitoring (quarterly) to demonstrate compliance with state and local subsurface boundary gas migration requirements; and instantaneous landfill surface monitoring (quarterly) to measure methane concentrations immediately above the surface of the landfill.</p> <p>Upon implementation of energy-related project design features, the project would reduce its energy demand in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. The project would not conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans, and would be consistent with the AB 32 goals and the City of San Diego Guidelines.</p>	

TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF SYCAMORE CANYON EXPANSION CITY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES From Table 5.1-1, Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan, Revised Final EIR August 2012		
APPLICABLE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND POLICIES	CONSISTENCY EVALUATION	CONSISTENT (YES/NO)
<p>f. Strive to incorporate existing mature trees and native vegetation into site designs.</p> <p>g. Minimize the use of landscape equipment powered by fossil fuels.</p> <p>h. Implement water conservation measures in site/building design and landscaping.</p> <p>i. Encourage the use of high efficiency irrigation technology, and recycled site water to reduce the use of potable water for irrigation. Use recycled water to meet the needs of development projects to the maximum extent feasible (see Policy CE-A.12).</p> <p><i>Policy CE-A.12:</i> Reduce the San Diego Urban Heat Island, through actions such as:</p> <p>Using cool roofing materials, such as reflective, low heat retention tiles, membranes and coatings, or vegetated eco-roofs to reduce heat build-up;</p> <p>Planting trees and other vegetation, to provide shade and cool air temperatures. In particular, properly position trees to shade buildings, air conditioning units, and parking lots; and</p> <p>Reducing heat build-up in parking lots through increased shading or use of cool paving materials as feasible (see also Urban Design Element, Policy UD-A.12).</p> <p><i>Policy CE-A.13:</i> Regularly monitor, update and implement the City's Climate Protection Action Plan to ensure, at a minimum compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws.</p> <p>a. Inventory greenhouse gas emissions, including emissions for the City community-at-large, and for the City as an organization.</p> <p>b. Identify actions and programs designed to reduce the climate change impacts caused by the community-atlarge and the City as an organization.</p>		

TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF SYCAMORE CANYON EXPANSION CITY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES From Table 5.1-1, Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan, Revised Final EIR August 2012		
APPLICABLE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND POLICIES	CONSISTENCY EVALUATION	CONSISTENT (YES/NO)
<p><b><i>Open Space and Landform Preservation Goals</i></b> <b>Goal:</b> Preservation and long-term management of the natural landforms and open spaces that help make San Diego unique. <i>Policy CE-B.1:</i> Protect and conserve the landforms, canyon lands, and open spaces that: define the City’s urban form; provide public views/vistas; serve as core biological areas and wildlife linkages; are wetlands habitats; provide buffers within and between communities; or provide outdoor recreational opportunities.</p> <p>b. Support the preservation of rural lands and open spaces throughout the region.</p> <p>c. Protect urban canyons and other important community open spaces including those that have been designated in community plans for the many benefits they offer locally, and regionally as part of a collective citywide open space system (see also Recreation Element, Sections C and F; Urban Design Element, Section A).</p> <p><i>Policy CE-B.4:</i> Limit and control runoff, sedimentation, and erosion both during and after construction activity</p>	<p>The project would cause a loss of open space which is discouraged by Policy CE-B.1. Because the project would redesignate 26 acres of Open Space to an Industrial and/or Landfill use, this change would conflict with the General Plan goals to preserve open space. The land area to be converted to landfill use is adjacent to the existing landfill facility which is a recognized use in both the General Plan and EECp, has been in existence for over 45 years, and is currently projected to remain operational until the year 2031. The long-term use for the landfill site, after facility closure, would be open space as indicated in the preliminary closure plan described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description [Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan]</i>. As described in Section 5.4, the on-site structures have been designed to reference the architectural style of the MTRP visitor’s center, and trail connections would be developed in the future as part of the final closure plan. Additionally, the biological mitigation program for the landfill expansion would preserve approximately 52 acres of additional open space within the MHPA surrounding the landfill property to compensate for biological resources impacts (refer to Section 5.5 of this EIR). Finally, the closed landfill would ultimately emulate and resemble the natural, undeveloped landforms surrounding the site as shown in the visual simulations contained in Section 5.4. Nonetheless, the project would be inconsistent with Policy CEB.1 due to the loss of natural open space prior to facility closure.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 5.12 of the Sycamore Landfill Master Development Plan Final EIR, the landfill operation is not located within a floodplain or floodway. It would continue to feature an active storm water management system approved by the RWQCB and Local Enforcement Agency (LEA). Thus, the project would not conflict with CE-B.4.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Yes</p>
<p><b><i>Urban Runoff Management Goals</i></b> <b>Goal:</b> Protection and restoration of water bodies, including reservoirs, coastal waters, creeks, bays, and wetlands. <b>Goal:</b> Preservation of natural attributes of both the floodplain and floodway without endangering life and property.</p> <p><i>Policy CE-E.2:</i> Apply water quality protection measures to land development projects early in the process-during project design, permitting, construction, and operations-in order to minimize the quantity of runoff generated on-site, the disruption of natural water flows and the contamination of storm water runoff.</p> <p>a. Increase on-site infiltration, and preserve, restore or incorporate natural drainage systems into site design.</p> <p>b. Direct concentrated drainage flows away from the MHPA and open space areas. If not possible, drainage should be directed into sedimentation basins, grassy swales or mechanical trapping devices prior to draining into the MHPA or open space areas.</p>	<p>As discussed in Section 5.12, the project would not result in substantial areas of new impervious surfaces (e.g., pavement) or associated runoff generation, with the overall existing drainage patterns to be maintained and applicable water quality controls implemented to ensure regulatory conformance. Specifically, the project would generally maintain current infiltration capacity, with only minor reductions related to development such as administrative and processing facilities. The proposed drainage system includes a series of slope drains and brow ditches (among other facilities) to route surface flows away from the landfill disposal areas to minimize ponding and infiltration on the landfill surface (and associated potential for leachate generation), as well as to avoid erosion in active and completed portions of the landfill. Surface drainage from the landfill property and associated off-site watershed areas would flow generally south and west to Little Sycamore Canyon and the San Diego River, similar to existing conditions. Flows from much of the landfill property would enter a proposed detention/ sedimentation basin at the southern end of the landfill, which would regulate flows and provide a controlled and treated discharge into Little Sycamore Canyon (which is within the MHPA) through an appropriate energy dissipation structure (e.g., a riprap apron). This active storm water management system would be approved by the RWQCB and LEA. Additional water quality protection would be provided through</p>	<p>Yes</p>

TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF SYCAMORE CANYON EXPANSION CITY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES From Table 5.1-1, Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan, Revised Final EIR August 2012		
APPLICABLE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND POLICIES	CONSISTENCY EVALUATION	CONSISTENT (YES/NO)
<p>c. Reduce the amount of impervious surfaces through selection of materials, site planning, and street design where possible.</p> <p>d. Increase the use of vegetation in drainage design.</p> <p>e. Maintain landscape design standards that minimize the use of pesticides and herbicides.</p> <p>f. Avoid development of areas particularly susceptible to erosion and sediment loss (e.g., steep slopes) and, where impacts are unavoidable, enforce regulations that minimize their impacts.</p> <p>g. Apply land use, site development, and zoning regulations that limit impacts on, and protect the natural integrity of topography, drainage systems, and water bodies.</p> <p>h. Enforce maintenance requirements in development permit conditions.</p> <p><i>Policy CE-E.3:</i> Require contractors to comply with accepted storm water pollution prevention planning practices for all projects.</p> <p>a. Minimize the amount of graded land surface exposed to erosion and enforce erosion control ordinances.</p> <p>b. Continue routine inspection practices to check for proper erosion control methods and housekeeping practices during construction.</p>	<p>existing and proposed efforts conducted pursuant to regulatory requirements including the NPDES Industrial General Permit and City Storm Water Standards. This would include measures to: (1) prevent pollutant discharge through “good housekeeping” practices, waste screening/ processing, erosion/ sedimentation controls, avoidance of chemical pesticide/herbicide use, proper material storage/ containment, and spill prevention/ control plans; (2) provide treatment through BMPs including the noted detention/ sedimentation basin, use of vegetated and/or rock-lined drainage features (e.g., swales and buffer strips), and installation of media filters in applicable areas (i.e., along the southern portion of the site access road); and (3) continue and expand monitoring, testing, reporting and maintenance efforts to identify potential water quality issues, ensure proper BMP function/ efficiency, and provide conformance with applicable regulatory standards. As a result, the project would not conflict with Policy CE-E.2, and pertinent requirements of Policy CE-E.3 would occur, as outlined below.</p> <p>As discussed above under Policy CE-E.2, project implementation would be subject to applicable regulatory requirements of the NPDES Industrial General Permit and City Storm Water Standards, including efforts to provide erosion/sedimentation controls and good housekeeping practices. In addition to the measures noted under Policy CE-E.2 (e.g., the proposed detention/sedimentation basin), this would include the use of BMPs such as inlet filters, erosion control mats, mulching, straw/hay bales, berms, fiber rolls, silt fences, dikes, biofilter/compost bags, hydroseeding with native plants, preventative maintenance (e.g., sediment basin inspection and repair), and removal of sediment and trash from paved areas such as access roads before it enters the drainage system through efforts including regular street sweeping. Based on the described efforts, the project would be consistent with Policy CE-E.3.</p>	
<p><b><i>Air Quality Goals</i></b> <b>Goal:</b> Regional air quality which meets state and federal standards. <b>Goal:</b> Reduction in greenhouse gas emissions effecting climate change.</p> <p><i>Policy CE-F.3:</i> Continue to use methane as an energy source from inactive and closed landfills.</p> <p><i>Policy CE-F.4:</i> Preserve and plant trees, and vegetation that are consistent with habitat and water conservation policies and that absorb carbon dioxide and pollutants.</p> <p><i>Policy CE-F.5:</i> Promote technological innovations to help reduce automobile, truck and other motorized equipment emissions.</p>	<p>SLI has an existing on-site cogeneration plant, which uses LFG, a by-product of solid waste decomposition composed of methane and carbon dioxide to generate electrical power. The GCCS would be expanded over time as necessary (as the amount of deposited waste increases), which would be consistent with Policy CE-F.3.</p> <p>Proposed landscaping would consist of a mix of new native trees, shrubs, and groundcover and would be implemented at each of the landfill support facilities. Project plans require use of plants native to southern California as well as naturalized plants compatible in water demand, exposure requirements, fire resistance, and slope (or non-slope) conditions. (Naturalized species would be adapted to survive without irrigation after establishment.) Irrigated areas would be on a climate-controlled sensor (to minimize or eliminate watering during rain events) and irrigation runoff or overspray would not cross property boundaries. Where possible, such as at the proposed administrative office building, preserved existing native vegetation would comprise important components of the landscape scheme. Thus, the project would be consistent with Policy CE-F.4.</p> <p>Construction of the project would incorporate on-site energy conservation and demand-side management features, including the limiting of trucks and construction equipment idle times to reduce fuel consumption and transportation energy demand. The MDP would implement state and federal vehicle emission reduction programs to reduce GHG emissions from on-site equipment, including the expanded list of early action measures approved by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) on October 25, 2007. Implementation of these programs would allow the project to comply with Policy CE-F.5.</p>	Yes
<p><b><i>Sustainable Energy Goals</i></b> <b>Goal:</b> An increase in local energy independence through conservation, efficient community design, reduced consumption, and efficient production and development of energy supplies that are divers, efficient, environmentally sound, sustainable, and reliable.</p> <p><i>Policy CE-I.4:</i> Maintain and promote water conservation and waste diversion programs to conserve energy.</p>	<p>Potable water use for the landfill is anticipated to increase from an average of 250 gpd to a maximum rate of 359 gpd upon implementation of the MDP. Since use of reclaimed water includes substantially less water supply and conveyance energy than potable water imported to the area, the project would use nonpotable water for as much of its water use as feasible. Proposed landscaping would consist of a mix of new and relocated native trees, shrubs, and groundcover, which would be adapted to survive without irrigation after establishment. Irrigated areas would be on a climate-controlled sensor (to minimize or eliminate watering during rain events).</p>	Yes

TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF SYCAMORE CANYON EXPANSION CITY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES From Table 5.1-1, Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan, Revised Final EIR August 2012		
APPLICABLE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND POLICIES	CONSISTENCY EVALUATION	CONSISTENT (YES/NO)
<p><i>Policy CE-I.8:</i> Improve fuel-efficiency to reduce consumption of fossil fuels.</p> <p><i>Policy CE-I.10:</i> Use renewable energy sources to generate energy to the extent feasible.</p>	<p>In addition to water conservation initiatives, the project would promote waste diversion by providing a new on-site public off-load and recycling area that is separate from the commercial area, establishing new material processing areas for construction and demolition (C&amp;D) debris and composting, and implementing other recycling operations, including enhanced green waste processing. Implementation of the proposed water conservation and waste diversion features would comply with Policy CE-I.4.</p> <p>The project would not change how transportation fuels or other energy resources are used or recovered for solid waste disposal or diversion at Sycamore Landfill. The rate and nature of fuel use for on-site equipment would not be substantially affected by the project; however, extending the life of the Sycamore Landfill would reduce the region’s use of transportation fuel in the future by preventing the need to transport waste to an alternative waste disposal facility farther from the population center. Waste haul truck trips to the landfill would use less fuel for a given quantity of waste than at any other approved or potential landfill site in the County. Therefore, implementation of the project may reduce the demand for transportation energy resources compared to transportation of waste to a more distant facility upon closure of the landfill, and the project would comply with Policy CE-I.8.</p> <p>As discussed under Policy CE-A.13, the Sycamore Landfill has a landfill GCCS that uses a portion of the collected LFG as a fuel for electrical generation turbines; LFG is considered a renewable energy source. Thus, the generation of electrical energy via the GCCS system would be consistent with Policy CE-I.10.</p>	
<p><b>Mineral Production Goals</b> <b>Goal:</b> Balance mineral production and conservation with habitat and topography protection.</p> <p><i>Policy CE-K.3:</i> Produce sand and gravel with minimal harm and disturbance to adjacent property and communities.</p>	<p>While portions of the project site and adjacent areas are designated as MRZ 2 (CGS 1996, City of San Diego 2008b), the native material to be excavated to construct disposal cells would be processed to produce commercial aggregate and exported, or stockpiled on site for use in base liner construction, landfill cover construction, and as landfill cover soil. Aggregate processing within the landfill was approved by the City of San Diego under PDP/SDP 40-0765 in 2002, and is expected to be completed by approximately 2020, but would be extended upon approval of the landfill expansion. Aggregate processing will occur at every location in which solid waste disposal would occur, within the lower elevation of areas under excavation. Rock and aggregate materials are transported off site to construction sites throughout the San Diego region to meet increasing needs for construction materials. Therefore, the project would be consistent with Policy CE-K.3.</p>	Yes
<b>Recreation Element</b>		
<p><b>Preservation Goals</b> <b>Goal:</b> Preserve, protect and enhance the integrity and quality of existing parks, open space, and recreation programs citywide.</p> <p><i>Policy RE-C.1:</i> Protect existing parklands and open space from unauthorized encroachment by adjacent development through appropriate enforcement measures.</p>	<p>The expansion and continued operation of the ongoing landfill operation would not promote unauthorized encroachment into the surrounding open space. Public access in the landfill area would be strictly regulated. After facility closure, the site would be available as open space and SLI would work with MTRP to facilitate trail connections to the park as part of the final closure plan process. Thus, the project would be consistent with Policy RE-C.1.</p>	Yes
<b>Noise Element</b>		
<p><b>Noise and Land Use Compatibility Goals</b> <b>Goal:</b> Consider existing and future noise levels when making land use planning decisions to minimize people’s exposure to excessive noise.</p> <p><i>Policy NE-A.1:</i> Separate excessive noise-generating uses from residential and other noise-sensitive land uses with a sufficient spatial buffer of less sensitive uses.</p> <p><i>Policy NE-A.2:</i> Assure the appropriateness of proposed developments relative to existing and future noise levels by consulting the guidelines for noise-compatible land use (shown on Table NE-3) to minimize the effects on noise-sensitive land uses.</p>	<p>As discussed in Section 5.3 and Appendices F1 through F5 of the Sycamore Landfill Master Development Plan Final EIR, the noise generated by landfill operations associated the project would not significantly impact any existing sensitive receptors. As the surrounding property is vacant, with the nearest residences being over 0.75-mile away from potential noise sources associated with the landfill, it is concluded that the operations would not affect sensitive receptors and would comply with the requirements of the City’s Noise Control Ordinance. Thus, the project would not conflict with Policies NE-A.1, A.2 and A.4.</p>	Yes

TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF SYCAMORE CANYON EXPANSION CITY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES From Table 5.1-1, Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan, Revised Final EIR August 2012		
APPLICABLE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND POLICIES	CONSISTENCY EVALUATION	CONSISTENT (YES/NO)
<i>Policy NE-A.4:</i> Require an acoustical study consistent with Acoustical Study Guidelines (Table NE-4) for proposed developments in areas where the existing or future noise level exceeds or would exceed the “compatible” noise level thresholds as indicated on the Land Use - Noise Compatibility Guidelines (Table NE-3), so that noise mitigation measures can be included in the project design to meet the noise guidelines.		
<b><i>Motor Vehicle Traffic Noise Goals</i></b> <b>Goal:</b> Minimal excessive motor vehicle traffic noise on residential and other noise-sensitive land uses.  <i>Policy NE-B.2:</i> Consider traffic calming design, traffic control measures, and low-noise pavement surfaces that minimize motor vehicle traffic noise (see also Mobility Element, Policy ME–C.5 regarding traffic calming).  <i>Policy NE-B.3:</i> Require noise reducing site design, and/or traffic control measures for new development in areas of high noise to ensure that the mitigated levels meet acceptable decibel limits.  <i>Policy NE-B.5:</i> Designate local truck routes to reduce truck traffic in noise-sensitive land uses area	As discussed in Section 5.3 of the Sycamore Landfill Master Development Plan Final EIR increases in ambient noise levels along roads serving the landfill would not significantly increase with approval of the project. The traffic noise levels in the residential areas would continue to not exceed the 65 dBA CNEL limit used by the City of San Diego, nor the 60 dBA CNEL criterion used by the City of Santee. Therefore, no conflict with Policy NE-B.2, NEB.3, or NE-B.5 would occur.	Yes
<b><i>Typical Noise Attenuation Methods Goal:</i></b> Attenuate the effect of noise on future residential and other noise-sensitive land uses by applying feasible noise mitigation measures.  <i>Policy NE-I.3:</i> Consider noise attenuation measures and techniques addressed by the Noise Element, as well as other feasible attenuation measures not addressed as potential mitigation measures, to reduce the effect of noise on future residential and other noise-sensitive land uses to an acceptable noise level.	As described earlier, the analysis of landfill noise impacts contained in Section 5.5 indicates that the landfill activities would not significantly impact existing sensitive receptors. Impacts to potential future residential would be assured through the use of noise berms, buffers and addressing heavy truck movement along the landfill access in future environmental reviews for development of residences along that road. Therefore, no conflict with Policy NE-I.3 would occur.	Yes
<b>Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element</b>		
<b><i>Storm Water Infrastructure Goals</i></b> <b>Goal:</b> Protection of beneficial water resources through pollution prevention and interception efforts.  <i>Policy PF-G.1:</i> Ensure that all storm water conveyance systems, structures, and maintenance practices are consistent with federal Clean Water Act and California Regional Water Quality Control Board NPDES Permit standards.  <i>Policy PF-G.2:</i> Install infrastructure that includes components to capture, minimize, and/or prevent pollutants in urban runoff from reaching receiving waters and potable water supplies.  <i>Policy PF-G.3:</i> Meet and preferably exceed regulatory mandates to protect water quality in a cost-effective manner monitored through performance measures.  <i>Policy PF-G.5:</i> Identify and implement BMPs for projects that repair, replace, extend or otherwise affect the storm water conveyance system. These projects should also include design considerations for maintenance, inspection, and, as applicable, water quality monitoring.	As discussed in relationship to Policies CE-B.2, B.3 and B.4 as well as Section 5.12 of the Sycamore Landfill Master Development Plan Draft EIR, the project includes a storm water control system that would be consistent with state and federal storm water control regulations and would protect beneficial uses of water resources in the area. Thus, the project would not conflict with Policy PF-G.1 through G.5.	Yes
<b><i>Waste Management Goals</i></b> <b>Goal:</b> Efficient, economical, environmentally-sound water collection, management, and disposal. <b>Goal:</b> Maximum diversion of materials from disposal through the reduction, reuse, and recycling of wastes to the highest and best use.  <i>Policy PF-I.2:</i> Maximize waste reduction and diversion (see also Conservation Element, Policy CE.A.9).  b. Operate public and private facilities that collect and transport waste and recyclable materials in accordance with the highest environmental standards.  d. Maximize the separation of recyclable and compostable materials.	The project would comply with state and federal environmental standards as conditions of permits required from state and federal agencies. The landfill would continue to implement standard disposal practices based on technologies available at this time. It will investigate alternatives to standard disposal practices as they are identified and approved by the regulatory agencies. Therefore, no conflict with Policy PF-I.2, b would occur.  The project would assist local agencies with the implementation of their Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRREs), consistent with minimization of possible environmental impacts by providing a new public off-load and recycling area that is separate from the commercial area; the establishment of a new C&D debris processing operation; continuation and expansion of greens processing; and other recycling operations. To ensure environmentally sound refuse collection and handling, Sycamore Landfill would continue current solid	Yes

TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF SYCAMORE CANYON EXPANSION CITY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES From Table 5.1-1, Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan, Revised Final EIR August 2012		
APPLICABLE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND POLICIES	CONSISTENCY EVALUATION	CONSISTENT (YES/NO)
<p>f. Reduce and recycle construction and demolition (C&amp;D) debris. Strive for recycling of 100 percent of inert C&amp;D materials and a minimum of 50 percent by weight of all other material.</p> <p>g. Use recycled, composted, and post-consumer materials in manufacturing, construction, public facilities and in other identified uses whenever appropriate</p> <p>h. Encourage advance disposal fees to prevent the disposal of materials that cause handling problems or hazards at landfills.</p> <p>i. Encourage the private sector to build a mixed construction and demolition waste materials recycling facility.</p> <p><i>Policy PF-I.3:</i> Provide environmentally sound waste disposal facilities and alternatives.</p> <p>a. Design and operate disposal facilities located within the City, or that serve as a destination for City waste, to meet or exceed the highest applicable environmental standards.</p> <p>d. Ensure environmentally and economically sound disposal options for materials that cannot be effectively reduced, reused, recycled, or composted.</p> <p>e. Plan for disposal needs considering factors such as trip distance and environmentally sound disposal capacity.</p> <p>g. Maximize environmental benefit in landfill-based waste diversion and effective load check programs by ensuring that recyclable or hazardous materials do not end up in the landfill.</p> <p>h. Use closed and inactive landfill sites for public benefits, such as provision of energy from waste generated methane, creation of wildlife habitat upon proper remediation or other land uses such as parks determined to be appropriate.</p> <p><i>Policy PF-I.5:</i> Plan for sufficient waste handling and disposal capacity to meet existing and future needs. Evaluate existing waste disposal facilities for potential expansion of sites for new disposal facilities.</p>	<p>waste intake screening procedures at the landfill scales; continue procedures to maximize exclusion of hazardous wastes, and procedures for management of any hazardous wastes that may be detected; implement approved waste spreading, compaction and covering procedures; continue management of surface water run-on and run-off; litter, vectors, and odor control procedures; implement existing fire controls, the emergency response plan; and spill prevention control and countermeasures plan. Sycamore Landfill would continue to accept solid waste, recyclables, C&amp;D, and greens materials, and dispose or process them in environmentally sound ways, as required by the landfill’s permits. Therefore, no conflict with Policy PF-I.2, d, f, g, h, or i would occur.</p> <p>SLI management has worked with both City of San Diego and City of Santee officials in the effort to develop the MDP, while reducing or avoiding potential project environmental impacts, and working to find the best practicable, environmentally safe and equitable solutions to solid waste management. Implementation of the MDP would provide additional disposal capacity for the City and the region, in a central location that minimizes waste haul distances and associated potential environmental impacts. Therefore, no conflict with Policy PF-I.3, a, d, or e would occur.</p> <p>Sycamore Landfill would continue to implement an effective hazardous waste exclusion program at the new scales facility to be built approximately one mile from the landfill entrance gate. Hazardous materials intercepted in that program would be stored temporarily at the site, and removed periodically and disposed at permitted hazardous materials facilities. A new public drop-off facility for general solid wastes and recyclables would be constructed near the planned new scales. The public facility would provide members of the general public with bins into which they could deposit waste, as well as various recyclable materials. Recyclable materials would be transported off-site to appropriate markets or end users. Waste auto oil and auto batteries would be collected at the public drop-off and recycling area, and periodically sent off site to an authorized recycling firm. In addition, enameled home appliances (white goods) and consumer electronic devices such as televisions, computer monitors, printers, computers, etc. would be accepted, temporarily stored on-site, and then sent off-site to an authorized recycling firm. This facility would eliminate the potentially unsafe mixing of small self-haul vehicles and large commercial collection and transfer trucks at the active face. Subject to regulatory approval, the project proposes to develop a facility at the landfill for processing and recycling source separated C&amp;D debris. The C&amp;D processing system would target primarily waste loads rich in wood and inert materials such as rock, brick, concrete and asphalt. Thus, the project would be consistent with Policy PF-I.3, g.</p> <p>At the end of its useful life, Sycamore Landfill would be closed according to the requirements of California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 27. Drainage control, landfill gas management and leachate management facilities would be provided upon closure of the site. Landfill gas would continue to be produced from landfill wastes for many years following landfill closure. This gas would continue to be used for generation of electrical energy (by a third party), and sold to the local electrical grid. Such energy production reduces the amount of fossil fuels needed to provide electricity for the region. Following closure of the landfill, the site would be revegetated using native plant species, and would be utilized for open space and habitat purposes. The actual design of the final cover would be conceptually addressed in a preliminary closure plan to be submitted to and approved by RWQCB prior to issuing revised Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) for the project, and in final closure plans to be submitted to and approved by the RWQCB, LEA, CIWMB and APCD prior to closure of the site.</p> <p>Structures and facilities not required for post-closure maintenance or environmental monitoring programs would be demolished and removed. Areas where structures are removed would be regarded and revegetated using native plants. Therefore, no conflict with Policy PF-I.3 would occur.</p>	

TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF SYCAMORE CANYON EXPANSION CITY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES From Table 5.1-1, Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan, Revised Final EIR August 2012		
APPLICABLE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND POLICIES	CONSISTENCY EVALUATION	CONSISTENT (YES/NO)
	The project would increase the allowable daily tonnage and associated traffic into and out of the landfill to assist in meeting future waste disposal needs of both the City and other jurisdictions in the region. The project would also make more effective use of a site already permitted for Class II landfill use by reconfiguring the development plans to increase solid waste disposal capacity vertically and horizontally without significantly expanding the horizontal extent of the waste disposal area. This would provide a convenient, centralized location for the disposal of municipal solid waste within the jurisdiction of the City of San Diego, with affordable and predictable costs to the City, both before and after anticipated closure of Miramar Landfill. Therefore, no conflict with Policy PF-I.5 would occur.	
<p><b>Public Utilities Goals</b></p> <p><i>Policy PF-M.1:</i> Ensure that public utilities are provided, maintained, and operated in a cost-effective manner that protects residents and enhances the environment.</p> <p><i>Policy PF-M.2:</i> Coordinate with all public and private utilities to focus utility capital investments and design projects to help implement the City of Villages strategy.</p> <p><i>Policy PF-M.3:</i> Integrate the design and siting of safe and efficient public utilities and associated facilities into the early stages of the long range planning and development process, especially in redevelopment/urban areas where land constraints exist.</p> <p><i>Policy PF-M.4:</i> Cooperatively plan for and design new or expanded public utilities and associated facilities (e.g. telecommunications infrastructure, planned energy generation facilities, gas compressor stations, gas transmission lines, electrical substations and other large scale gas and electrical facilities) to maximize environmental and community benefits.</p> <p>a. Use transmission corridors to enhance and complement wildlife movement areas and preserved open space habitat as identified in the City’s Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP).</p> <p>b. Provide adequate buffering and maintain landscaping between utility facilities and residential and nonresidential uses, including the use of non-building areas and/or rear setbacks.</p> <p>c. Maximize land use and community benefit by locating compatible/appropriate uses within utility easements/right-of-ways (e.g. passive parkland, natural open space, wildlife movement, urban gardens, plant nurseries, parking, access roads, and trails). Trails can be allowed in these easements/right-of ways, provided proper indemnification, funding and maintenance is set forth in written agreement between the public utility, the City, and project developer.</p> <p>d. For projects, in particular large-scale developments (such as those requiring redevelopment plans, community plan updates, general plan amendments), consult and coordinate with all applicable public utilities early on to determine the type, size, and location of facilities that are needed to accommodate the project’s increased demand.</p> <p>e. Incorporate public art within public utility facilities, especially in urban areas.</p> <p>f. Ensure utility projects account for maintenance of community streetscape elements and street trees.</p> <p>g. Coordinate projects in the public right-of-way with all utility providers.</p>	<p>The MDP project proposes relocation of existing transmission lines to a new alignment that is removed from the active landfill area, which would provide for improved safety, and more effective maintenance and operation of the lines. Early consultation and coordination with the SDG&amp;E has been actively occurring throughout project planning. SDG&amp;E will be required to apply for a permit from the CPUC for the transmission line relocation. Consistency with the City requirements on open space preservation, wildlife movement, and habitat conservation is addressed in Section 5.5. Therefore, no conflict with Policies PFM. 1 through PF-M.4 would occur.</p>	Yes
<p><b>Public Utilities Goals (cont.)</b></p> <p><i>Policy PF-N.4:</i> Coordinate the timing and development of new or expanded regional facilities to precede the development they will support.</p>	Implementation of the project would provide at additional solid waste disposal capacity to the region, in advance of need. Therefore, no conflict with Policy PF-N.4 would occur.	Yes



TABLE 3 - GENERAL PLAN POLICIES DEEMED NOT APPLICABLE (CONTINUED)

TABLE 4 ANALYSIS OF SYCAMORE CANYON EXPANSION CITY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES From Table 5.1-1, Sycamore Canyon Landfill Master Development Plan, Revised Final EIR August 2012		
APPLICABLE ELEMENTS, GOALS, AND POLICIES	CONSISTENCY EVALUATION	CONSISTENT (YES/NO)
East Eliot Community Plan		
<b>Open Space Management Guidelines:</b> 1. Natural open space areas should remain undeveloped with disturbance limited to trails and passive recreational uses such as walking, hiking and nature study that are consistent with preservation of natural resources.	Approximately 26 acres of land designated for Open Space in the EECF would be converted to Landfill use. As discussed under Policy UD-A.1, the land to be converted from Open Space to Landfill lies adjacent to the approved landfill which reduces its inherent value as open space. Therefore, the loss of open space would conflict with Guideline 1.	No
8. At locations where roads, railroads or other urban intrusions traverse open space corridors, provisions should be made to minimize habitat fragmentation and to provide for a continuous open space linkage. In some instances, structures such as bridges or culverts should be sited in lower quality habitat or in disturbed areas to the extent possible.	No new roads would traverse open space corridors; the landfill access road would continue to be used to traverse between the facility entrance and the waste disposal area. Re-routing of the access road to facilitate the maintenance facility installation and operations would not intrude into open space as it would be co-located with the sedimentation basin. Therefore, no conflict with Guideline 8 would occur.	Yes
City of Santee General Plan		
<i>Policy 9.2:</i> The City should oppose any expansion or operational changes at the Sycamore Landfill that will result in increased land use compatibility impacts to the City, unless they can be adequately mitigated.	<p>The primary potential for land use compatibility issues are related to noise and odors associated with landfill operations. As discussed in Section 5.3 and 5.6, <i>Air Quality</i>, the operation of the landfill would not create significant land use compatibility impacts on the Santee residents in the area.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 5.3 of the Sycamore Landfill Master Development Plan Final EIR, noise associated with the landfill operations would not exceed levels considered unacceptable by the City of San Diego’s Noise Element or Noise Control Element. In addition, the noise levels would not exceed levels considered acceptable by the City of Santee. Thus, no incompatibility would result from landfill operation noise.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 5.6 and detailed in Appendix I3 of the Sycamore Landfill Master Development Plan Final EIR , odors associated with the landfill operations would not adversely impact nearby residential areas. SLI would continue to implement its Odor Management Plan, as described in Section 3.0, which would involve feedback from the local community should odor issues arise in the future (refer to Appendix I2 of the Sycamore Landfill Master Development Plan Final EIR). To further reduce the potential for odors, the MDP establishes a limit for green waste handling (Figure 3-7 of the Sycamore Landfill Master Development Plan Final EIR). Under this limit, no green waste handling would occur within 150 feet of the current eastern ridge of the landfill. Therefore, no conflict with Policy 9.2 would occur.</p>	Yes

